

CLARK HILL PLC
Myriah V. Jaworski, Esq. (SBN 336898)
mjaworski@clarkhill.com
One America Plaza
600 West Broadway, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 557-0404
Facsimile: (619) 557-0460

Attorneys for Defendant 1 HOTEL WEST
HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, AN
INDIVIDUAL; TATEVIK
KHACHATRYAN, AN INDIVIDUAL;
B.A.J., A MINOR; AND I.M., A
MINOR,

Plaintiffs,

v.

1 HOTEL WEST HOLLYWOOD,
L.L.C.,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:23-cv-10829

**DECLARATION OF MYRIAH V.
JAWORSKI IN SUPPORT OF
DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO
COMPEL PLAINTIFFS'
DISCOVERY RESPONSES AND
THE DEPOSITION OF PLAINTIFF
SUNNY KHACHATRYAN**

Discovery Cut-Off: 11/25/2024
Pre-Trial Conference: 4/7/2025
Trial: 4/29/2025
Hearing Date: 9/13/2024
Time: 9:30 a.m.

I, Myriah V. Jaworski, declare under penalty of perjury as follow:

1. I am a resident of the State of California.
2. I am an attorney representing 1 Hotel West Hollywood, LLC ("1 Hotel") in this matter.
3. I am of sound mind, I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this Declaration, and I have authority to make this Declaration on behalf of 1 Hotel.

1 4. I attempted to confer with Plaintiffs' counsel regarding the relief sought
2 in the present motion on numerous occasions, over a period of time ranging from at
3 least May 9, 2024, through July 30, 2024.

4 **I. Federal Rule 26(a)(1)(A)(iii) Damages Computation**

5 5. On May 3, 2024, Plaintiffs issued its first Federal Rule of Civil
6 Procedure 26(a)(1) Initial Disclosures. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is a true and
7 correct copy of Plaintiffs' Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1) Initial
8 Disclosures.

9 6. On May 9, 2024, 1 Hotel sent its Local Rule 37-1 pre-filing conference
10 letter related to Rule 26 disclosure deficiencies to Plaintiffs. Attached hereto as
11 **Exhibit 2** is a true and correct copy of 1 Hotel's Local Rule 37-1 correspondence
12 related to Rule 26 Initial Disclosure deficiencies.

13 7. I made no less than four (4) additional requests for Plaintiffs to
14 supplement their deficient Rule 26 disclosures. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 3** is a true
15 and correct copy of an email chain with the most recent email sent by me on June
16 21, 2024.

17 8. On June 21, 2024, Plaintiffs issued its second supplemental Federal
18 Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1) Initial Disclosures. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 4** is
19 a true and correct copy of Plaintiffs' Second Supplemental Federal Rule of Civil
20 Procedure 26(a)(1) Initial Disclosures.

21 9. I made an additional request for Plaintiffs to again supplement their
22 deficient Rule 26 disclosures to include proper damages calculations, as required by
23 Rule 26(a)(1)(A)(iii). Attached hereto as **Exhibit 5** is a true and correct copy of an
24 email chain with the most recent email sent by me on July 12, 2024.

25 10. Plaintiffs have failed to respond to 1 Hotel's Local Rule 37-1 requests
26 or supplement their Rule 26 damages computation.
27
28

1 **II. Discovery Requests**

2 **A. Interrogatories**

3 11. On June 14, 2024, 1 Hotel issued its First Set of Interrogatories.
4 Attached hereto as **Exhibit 6** is a true and correct copy of 1 Hotel's First of
5 Interrogatories.

6 12. On July 16, 2024, Plaintiffs issued their responses to the
7 Interrogatories, asserting blanket objections to each individual request. Attached
8 hereto as **Exhibit 7** is a true and correct copy of Plaintiffs' Responses to 1 Hotel's
9 First of Interrogatories.

10 13. Plaintiffs have failed to provide substantive responses to all
11 Interrogatories.

12 **B. Requests for Production of Documents**

13 14. On June 14, 2024, 1 Hotel issued its First Set of Requests for
14 Production. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 8** is a true and correct copy of 1 Hotel's First
15 of Request for Production.

16 15. On July 16, 2024, Plaintiffs issued their responses to the Requests for
17 Production, asserting blanket objections to each individual request. Attached hereto
18 as **Exhibit 9** is a true and correct copy of Plaintiffs' Responses to 1 Hotel's First of
19 Request for Production.

20 16. One of Plaintiffs' blanket objections asserted in response to each
21 Request for Production stated that the documents sought are confidential and will
22 not be produced prior to the entry of a protective order.

23 17. While 1 Hotel disputes that the information sought is confidential, it
24 nonetheless prepared and proposed a draft protective order for Plaintiffs review on
25 July 16, 2024 – Plaintiffs did not acknowledge or otherwise respond to the protective
26 order. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 10** is a true and correct copy of 1 Hotel's proposed
27 protective order.
28

1 18. On July 26, 2024, Plaintiffs issued a small document production,
2 responsive to only one Request for Production with the documents limited to only
3 Plaintiff I.M, and without any formal response or specification detailing which
4 request the documents were responsive to.

5 19. Plaintiffs have only made the very limited document production on July
6 26, 2024, with the remainder of the Requests for Production lacking any substantive
7 response.

8 20. As of the date of this Declaration, the Discovery Requests remain
9 largely unanswered.

10 **III. Notice of Deposition**

11 21. On July 12, 2024, 1 Hotel issued a Notice of Deposition for Plaintiff
12 Sunny Khachatryan set for August 7, 2024. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 11** is a true
13 and correct copy of 1 Hotel's Notice of Deposition issued to Sunny Khachatryan.

14 22. Plaintiffs have entirely failed to acknowledge receipt of the Notice of
15 Deposition and did not present Sunny Khachatryan on August 7th.

16 23. Plaintiffs further failed to provide potential alternative dates to present
17 Sunny Khachatryan for her deposition and the deposition remains outstanding.

18 **IV. C.D. Cal. Local Rule 37-1 Requests for Pre-Filing Conference**

19 24. On July 16, 2024, 1 Hotel sent its Local Rule 37-1 pre-filing conference
20 letter to Plaintiffs. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 12** is a true and correct copy of 1
21 Hotel's Local Rule 37-1 correspondence related to written discovery deficiencies.

22 25. On July 17, 2024, I sent a follow-up request to my July 16, 2024 Local
23 Rule 37- letter requesting Plaintiffs' availability for a pre-filing conference.

24 26. On July 19, 2024, I sent another follow-up request to my July 16, 2024
25 Local Rule 37- letter requesting Plaintiffs' availability for a pre-filing conference.

26 27. On July 30, 2024, I made a final follow-up request to my July 16, 2024
27 letter to meet for a pre-filing conference, pursuant to Local Rule 37-1, and Plaintiffs'
28 counsel failed to meet or otherwise respond. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 13** is a true

1 and correct copy of an email chain with the most recent email sent by me on July 30,
2 2024.

3 28. As of the date of this Declaration, 1 Hotel has received neither
4 Plaintiffs' supplemental substantive responses to outstanding Discovery Requests,
5 nor any response to its requests to meet and confer.

6 29. Plaintiffs' counsel's refusal to cooperate in the pre-filing conference
7 procedure necessitates the filing of this Motion pursuant to Local Rule 37-2.4

8 I declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct.

9
10 *AFFIANT FURTHER SAYETH NAUGHT.*

11
12 Executed this 19th day of August 2024.

13 /s/ Myriah V. Jaworski

14 Myriah V. Jaworski
15 Clark Hill PLC
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Exhibit 1

1 TYLER R. DOWDALL, State Bar No. 258950
tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com

2 RENATA A. GUIDRY, State Bar No. 227713
rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com

3 **TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP**

2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N

4 Los Angeles, California 90067

Telephone: (424) 330-8580

5 Facsimile: (315) 512-1465

6 BRIAN BLOOM (*pro hac vice*)

bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com

7 ELIEZER LEKHT (*pro hac vice*)

elekht@tarterkrinsky.com

8 **TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP**

1350 Broadway

9 New York, New York 10018

Telephone: (212) 574-0350

10 Facsimile: (212) 216-8001

11 *Attorneys for* Plaintiffs Sunny
Khachatryan, Tatevik Khachatryan, B.A.J,
12 a minor and I.M, a minor

13
14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
15 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
16

17 SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, an
individual; TATEVIK
18 KHACHATRYAN, an individual; B. A.
J, a minor; and I.M, a minor,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 vs.

21
22 1 HOTEL WEST HOLLYWOOD,
L.L.C.; SH GROUP OPERATIONS,
23 L.L.C.; SH GROUP GLOBAL IP
HOLDINGS, L.L.C; and DOES 1
24 through 70, inclusive,

25 Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-10829-ODW(Ex)

**PLAINTIFFS SUNNY
KHACHATRYAN, AN
INDIVIDUAL; TATEVIK
KHACHATRYAN, AN
INDIVIDUAL; B. A. J, A MINOR;
AND I.M, A MINOR'S RULE
26(A)(1) INITIAL DISCLOSURES**

Honorable Otis D. Wright II
Honorable Charles F. Eick

Complaint Filed: December 27, 2023
Trial Date: April 29, 2025

Pursuant to Rule 26(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, an individual (“S. Khachatryan”; TATEVIK KHACHATRYAN, an individual (“T. Khachatryan”); B. A. J, a minor (“B.A.J.”); and I.M, a minor, (“I.M”, collectively with S. Khachatryan; T. Khachatryan and B.A.J, known as the “Plaintiffs”), through their counsel, provides the following initial disclosures. Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend, revise or supplement these disclosures in supplemental disclosures served under Fed. R. Civ. P. Rules 26(a)(1) or 26(e)(1), in written discovery responses, in deposition testimony, or by any other means as the case progresses.

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Plaintiffs’ initial disclosures are based on information reasonably available to Plaintiffs as of the date of these disclosures. Plaintiffs’ pre-trial discovery, investigation, and analysis have not been completed, and it is anticipated further discovery, investigation, research, as well as the analysis of any existing discovery, may supply additional facts, add meaning to known facts, or establish entirely new factual conclusions. Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend or supplement these disclosures in the event Plaintiffs subsequently discovers additional relevant facts, information, or documents pursuant to Rule 26(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. By making these disclosures, Plaintiffs do not represent any particular document exists within their possession, custody, or control.

The lists of witnesses and documents set forth herein are preliminary and are neither intended nor represented to be final. Plaintiffs expressly reserve the right to identify and call as witnesses persons in addition to those listed below if during Plaintiffs’ discovery and investigation, Plaintiffs discover additional persons with knowledge of relevant facts and information.

Plaintiffs do not waive any applicable privileges, and specifically reserves those privileges including, but not limited to, the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product doctrine. These disclosures are made subject to and without

1 limiting any of the foregoing reservations.

2 **II. RULE 26(a)(1) INITIAL DISCLOSURES**

3 **A. LIST OF WITNESSES**

4 Pursuant to Rule 26(a)(1)(A)(i)–The name and, if known, the address and
 5 telephone number of each individual likely to have discoverable information–along
 6 with the subjects of that information–that the disclosing party may use to support his
 7 or her claims or defenses, unless the use would be solely for impeachment:

Name of Person	Person’s Address and Telephone Number	Description of What the Person Knows
<p>8 Sunny Khachatryan, an individual (Plaintiff)</p>	<p>9 c/o TYLER R. DOWDALL, TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N Los Angeles, CA 90067 tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com</p> <p>15 BRIAN BLOOM (<i>pro hac vice</i>) bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com ELIEZER LEKHT (<i>pro hac vice</i>) elekht@tarterkrinsky.com TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP 1350 Broadway New York, New York 10018 Telephone: (212) 574-0350 Facsimile: (212) 216-8001</p>	<p>10 • Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint</p>
<p>21 Tatevik Khachatryan, an individual (Plaintiff)</p>	<p>22 c/o TYLER R. DOWDALL, TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N Los Angeles, CA 90067 tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com</p> <p>27 BRIAN BLOOM (<i>pro hac vice</i>) bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com ELIEZER LEKHT (<i>pro hac vice</i>)</p>	<p>23 • Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint</p>

1		elekht@tarterkrinsky.com TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP 1350 Broadway New York, New York 10018 Telephone: (212) 574-0350 Facsimile: (212) 216-8001	
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	B.A.J., an minor (Plaintiff)	c/o TYLER R. DOWDALL, TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N Los Angeles, CA 90067 tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com BRIAN BLOOM (<i>pro hac vice</i>) bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com ELIEZER LEKHT (<i>pro hac vice</i>) elekht@tarterkrinsky.com TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP 1350 Broadway New York, New York 10018 Telephone: (212) 574-0350 Facsimile: (212) 216-8001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18	I.M., a minor (Plaintiff)	c/o TYLER R. DOWDALL, TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N Los Angeles, CA 90067 tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com BRIAN BLOOM (<i>pro hac vice</i>) bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com ELIEZER LEKHT (<i>pro hac vice</i>) elekht@tarterkrinsky.com TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP 1350 Broadway New York, New York 10018 Telephone: (212) 574-0350 Facsimile: (212) 216-8001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

<p>Person Most Knowledgeable at SH Hotels & Resorts, (Person Most Knowledgeable for Defendants)</p>	<p>c/o Defendants' counsel of record</p>	<p>• Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

B. LIST OF DOCUMENTS AND THINGS

Plaintiffs identify the following categories of documents that Plaintiffs presently believe they may use to support their claims. This information is based on Plaintiffs' investigation to date, which is ongoing and Plaintiffs specifically reserve the right to identify additional categories and locations of documents as discovery proceeds:

Category of Documents	Location of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents relating to Defendants' defenses. • Documents relating to Defendants' posting and use of the photograph; • Inventory and sales of the products depicted in the photograph • Defendants' internal communications regarding use of the photographs 	<p>SH Hotels & Resorts c/o Clark Hill LLP 600 West Broadway, Suite 500 San Diego CA 92101</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents relating to Plaintiffs' modeling work 	<p>c/o Tarter Krinsky & Drogin, LLP 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N Los Angeles, CA 90067</p>

Plaintiffs expressly reserve the right to amend or supplement these responses to reflect information acquired through discovery or other means.

C. PLAINTIFFS/CLAIMANTS: DAMAGES CALCULATION

Rule 26(a)(1)(A)(iii)—A computation of each category of damages claimed by the disclosing party, who must also make available for inspection and copying as under Rule 34 the documents or other evidentiary material (unless privileged or protected from disclosure) on which each computation is based, including materials

1 bearing on the nature and extent of injuries suffered:

2 Plaintiffs seek monetary relief.

3 **D. DEFENDANT(S): LIABILITY INSURANCE**

4 Rule 26(a)(1)(A)(iv)–For inspection and copying as under Rule 34, any
5 insurance agreement under which an insurance business may be liable to satisfy all or
6 part of a possible judgment in the action or to indemnify or reimburse for payments
7 made to satisfy the judgment:

8 Plaintiffs are unaware of any insurance.

9 **III. CERTIFICATION**

10 The undersigned counsel certifies under Rule 26(g)(1)(A) to the best of their
11 knowledge, information, and belief, formed after a reasonable inquiry, that these
12 disclosures are complete and correct as of this date.

13
14 *(Attorney signatures on following page)*
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 DATED: May 3, 2024

TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP

2 By: /s/ Tyler R. Dowdall

3 Tyler R. Dowdall, State Bar No. 258950

4 tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com

5 Renata A. Guidry, State Bar No. 227713

6 rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com

TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP

7 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N

8 Los Angeles, California 90067

9 Telephone: (424) 330-8580

Facsimile: (315) 512-1465

10 Brian Bloom (*pro hac vice*)

11 bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com

12 Eliezer Lekht (*pro hac vice*)

13 elekht@tarterkrinsky.com

TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP

14 1350 Broadway

15 New York, New York 10018

16 Telephone: (212) 574-0350

17 Facsimile: (212) 216-8001

18 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs Sunny Khachatryan,*
19 *Tatevik Khachatryan, B.A.J, a minor and I.M, a*
20 *minor*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

**SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, an individual, et al. v. 1 HOTEL WEST
HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and **not a party to this action**. I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. My business address is 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N, Los Angeles, CA 90067.

On May 3, 2024, I served true copies of the following document(s) described as **PLAINTIFFS SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, AN INDIVIDUAL; TATEVIK KHACHATRYAN, AN INDIVIDUAL; B. A. J, A MINOR; AND I.M, A MINOR'S RULE 26(A)(1) INITIAL DISCLOSURES** on the interested parties in this action as follows:

CLARK HILL LLP
Myriah Jaworski
mjaworski@clarkhill.com

One America Plaza
600 West Broadway, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 557-0404
Facsimile: (619) 557-0460

Attorneys for Defendants 1
HOTEL WESTHOLLYWOOD,
L.L.C.; SH GROUP
OPERATIONS, L.L.C.;
SH GROUP GLOBAL IP
HOLDINGS, L.L.C.

BY E-MAIL OR ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION: I caused a copy of the document(s) to be sent from e-mail address BGenser@tarterkrinsky.com to the persons at the e-mail addresses listed in the Service List. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on May 3, 2024, at Los Angeles, California.

/s/ Brooke M. Genser

Brooke M. Genser

Exhibit 2



Nicolas V. Dolce
D (312) 360-2113
Email: ndolce@clarkhill.com

Clark Hill
130 E. Randolph Street, Suite 3900
Chicago, Illinois 60601
T (312) 985-5900
F (312) 985-5999

May 9, 2024

VIA EMAIL ONLY

Tyler R. Dowdall, tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com
Renata A. Guidry, rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com
Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP
2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N
Los Angeles, California 90067

Brian Bloom, bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com
Eliezer Lekht, elekht@tarterkrinsky.com
Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP
1350 Broadway
New York, New York 10018

Re: Discovery Deficiency Correspondence L.R. 37-1 Correspondence

Sunny Khachatryan, et. al. v. 1 Hotel West Hollywood, LLC, et. al.

Case No. 2:23-cv-10829-ODW (C.D. Cal.)

Dear Counsel:

We write to pursuant to Local Rule 37-1 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 37, to request Plaintiffs supplementation of the deficiencies in their Rule 26(a)(1) Initial Disclosures ("Disclosures") served on Defendants on May 3, 2024.

Pursuant to Local Rule 37-1, by May 17, 2024, please supplement the necessary initial information requested in this correspondence.

Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(A)(i), Plaintiffs have a duty to disclose the identity, contact information, and subjects of information of all potential witnesses with knowledge concerning any allegations contained in the Complaint. Plaintiffs' Disclosures are incomplete as provided and fail to fully disclose all persons who have knowledge relevant to Plaintiffs' allegations related to third parties with whom Plaintiffs B.A.J. and I.M. ("Minor Plaintiffs") purportedly have contractual business agreements with.

Sunny Khachatryan, et. al. v. 1 Hotel West Hollywood, LLC, et. al.
Case No. 2:23-cv-10829-ODW (C.D. Cal.) – L.R. 37-1 Correspondence
May 9, 2024
Page 2

Plaintiffs' Complaint contains a number of allegations referencing purported branding deals, modeling contracts, talent representations, endorsements, and more. Specifically, Defendants request Plaintiffs supplement the following information in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e):

- The identity and contact information of any third-party representative(s) with knowledge of the Minor Plaintiffs' appearance in "television commercials, print ads, and other paid commercial uses of their images and likeness". See Compl. ¶ 5.
- The identity and contact information of any third-party representative(s) from Adidas with knowledge of the Minor Plaintiffs' purported modeling contracts with Adidas. See Compl. ¶ 5.
- The identity and contact information of all third-party "talent agents" and "talent management" representatives the Minor Plaintiffs have been represented by within the last five (5) years. See Compl. ¶ 6.
- The identity and contact information of any third-party representative(s) with knowledge of the Minor Plaintiffs' consideration for a "multi-million-dollar hotel endorsement". See Compl. ¶ 7.
- The identity and contact information of any third-party representative(s) with knowledge of the Minor Plaintiffs' consideration for the alleged multiple modeling contracts for "several five-star hotel chains". See Compl. ¶ 7.

Defendants' request for supplementation of information required by Rule 26(a)(1) is readily and easily accessible, and necessary for Defendants to fully investigate Plaintiffs' claims and alleged damages. Thus, Plaintiffs' voluntary provision of this information will avoid unnecessary discovery costs for both parties. Please supplement this information pursuant to LR 37-1, by no later than May 17, 2024. If you believe conferral is necessary, please propose some dates and times you are available for the week of May 13, 2024.

Sincerely,

/s/ Nicolas V. Dolce

Nicolas V. Dolce

Exhibit 3

Dolce, Nicolas

From: Jaworski, Myriah
Sent: Friday, June 21, 2024 12:25 PM
To: Tyler R. Dowdall; Brian A. Bloom; Dolce, Nicolas
Cc: Eliezer Lekht; Lisa Niewdach; Patel, Chirag; Brooke Genser
Subject: RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

All –

As required by Rule 26(a)(iii), please provide Plaintiffs computation of damages to us by COB today.

Thanks,
Myriah

From: Jaworski, Myriah
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2024 12:09 PM
To: Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>; Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>
Cc: Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>; Brooke Genser <bgenser@tarterkrinsky.com>
Subject: RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

Brian and Tyler,

We are in receipt of the Plaintiffs updated initial disclosures, and intend to send out third party discovery this week.

First, I note that none of the disclosures appear to be of hotel chains/brands, as we would have expected in light of paragraph 7 of the Complaint's allegation of "multi million dollar hotel endorsement and modeling contracts for several five-star hotel chains." Please confirm that Plaintiffs do not have any hotel brands or chains to disclose.

Second, Plaintiffs supplemental disclosures still do not comply with Rule 26(a)(iii)'s requirement for a "computation of each category of damages claimed." Please provide this computation to us not later than this Friday, June 21.

Defendant reserves all rights, including under Rule 37, to move to prohibit the use at trial of any information required to be disclosed by Rule 26(a) that is not properly disclosed.

Thanks,
Myriah

From: Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2024 12:25 AM
To: Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>; Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>; Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>
Cc: Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>; Brooke Genser <bgenser@tarterkrinsky.com>
Subject: RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

[External Message]

Myriah,

Please see the attached. We'll formally serve this tomorrow.



Tyler R. Dowdall | Partner

T: 424-330-8580 | F: 212-216-8001

tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com | Bio

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP

2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N | Los Angeles | CA | 90067

www.tarterkrinsky.com | LinkedIn

Crain's 2023 best places to work in NYC

From: Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>

Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 8:40 AM

To: Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>; Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>

Cc: Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>

Subject: [EXT] RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

Brian – we expect the updated supplemental disclosures from plaintiffs by COB today.

Thanks,
Myriah

From: Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>

Sent: Thursday, June 6, 2024 12:24 PM

To: Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>; Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>

Cc: Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>; Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>

Subject: RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

[External Message]

Myriah –

We just received the requested information from our clients this week and will be sending over supplemental disclosures to you shortly. We apologize for the delay but do not believe your client has been harmed. We certainly conducted our due diligence before filing our Complaint. Your client certainly did NOT take appropriate precautions before using our minor client's images publicly for its own commercial gain.

All rights remain reserved.

All the best,
Brian

Brian A. Bloom | Partner



T: 212-574-0350 | T: 516-464-3570 | M: 516-330-8123
bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com | Bio
Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP
1350 Broadway | New York | NY | 10018
www.tarterkrinsky.com | LinkedIn

Crain's 2023 best places to work in NYC

From: Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 6, 2024 12:19 PM
To: Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>; Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>
Cc: Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>
Subject: [EXT] RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

Brian,

One month ago, on May 9, we wrote to you to request that the Khachatryan plaintiffs update their initial disclosures to include the identities and contact information for the branding deals, modeling contracts, and talent agents with whom the minor children allegedly have contracts – including specifically the identity of those involved in consideration of the minors' "multi-million dollar hotel endorsement" and contacts with "several five star hotel chains." Comp'l. ¶ 7. As you know, this information is the basis for Plaintiffs' claims, and specifically their calculation of potential damages. This information is discoverable, relevant, and fundamental to SH Group's defenses.

On May 21 we followed up regarding the status of this information, and specifically asked to meet and confer on the issue. We were told that you were "waiting for further information from the clients" and would respond to us shortly. On May 27, we followed up again regarding our request, and have not received a response from you.

There is no justification for your failure to provide this information to us. First, this information should already be known to you in connection with your Rule 11 and other ethical obligations to conduct due diligences on these third-party contracts **before** including such allegations in the complaint. *See Refac Int'l, Ltd. v. Hitachi Ltd.*, 141 F.R.D. 281 (C.D. Cal. 1991) (finding that counsel violated its affirmative duty to investigate before a paper is filed with the court and sanctions were expressly required under Rule 11); *see also Truesdell v. S. Calif. Permanente Med. Group*, 209 F.R.D. 169, 173-73 (C.D. Cal. 2002). Thus, this information should be within your possession, readily available and capable of disclosure, and not something that is only now being "run down" by you with your clients.

Second, your failure to timely provide this information is also harmful to SH Group, which has the right to investigate these allegations, present a defense, and prepare for trial. As you know, the parties are subject to the Court's ordered discovery schedule, which includes a Fall 2024 fact discovery cut-off date. Among other things, your failure to timely disclose this information is preventing SH Group from serving necessary third-party document requests, interrogatories and deposition notices.

Thus, I am writing for a final time to request that Plaintiffs supplement their initial disclosures as requested by SH Group's May 9 correspondence, no later than close of business on **Monday, June 10.**

SH Group reserves all rights and remedies regarding this issue, including the right to seek discovery and case-dispositive sanctions and Rule 11 sanctions against all counsel of record.

Thanks,
Myriah

From: Jaworski, Myriah
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2024 1:07 PM
To: Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>; Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>
Cc: Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>
Subject: RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

Tyler,

When can we expect this information?

Thanks,
Myriah

From: Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 12:14 PM
To: Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>; Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>
Cc: Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>
Subject: RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

[External Message]

Nicolas,

Thanks for the follow up.

We are waiting for further information from the clients and will get back to you.

Thanks,



Tyler R. Dowdall | Partner
T: 424-330-8580 | F: 212-216-8001
tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com | Bio
Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP
2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N | Los Angeles | CA | 90067
www.tarterkrinsky.com | LinkedIn

Crain's 2023 best places to work in NYC

From: Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 8:20 AM
To: Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>
Cc: Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>
Subject: [EXT] RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

Counsel,

I am following up on Defendants' previously issued discovery correspondence, reattached here for convenience. Given the lack of response to Defendants' correspondence, we request to meet and confer on Plaintiffs' deficient disclosures. Please propose some dates and times that you are available to confer either this week or next.

Respectfully,

Nicolas V. Dolce

Attorney at Law

Clark Hill

130 E. Randolph Street, Suite 3900, Chicago, IL 60601

+1 312.360.2113 (office) | +1 312.517.7580 (fax)

ndolce@clarkhill.com | www.clarkhill.com

From: Dolce, Nicolas

Sent: Thursday, May 9, 2024 12:22 PM

To: Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>

Cc: Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>

Subject: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

Counsel,

Pursuant to Local Rule 37-1, please find attached Defendants' discovery correspondence concerning deficiencies in Plaintiffs' Rule 26 initial disclosures.

Respectfully,

Nicolas V. Dolce

Attorney at Law

Clark Hill

130 E. Randolph Street, Suite 3900, Chicago, IL 60601

+1 312.360.2113 (office) | +1 312.517.7580 (fax)

ndolce@clarkhill.com | www.clarkhill.com

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin is fully operational in-person. However, because of anticipated delays in receiving regular mail and other deliveries, please e-mail copies of anything you send by regular mail or delivery, including issuing remittances electronically. Please contact our receptionist at reception@tarterkrinsky.com or by phone at 212-216-8000 with any questions. Thank you in advance for your courtesies.

NOTE: If regular mailing or other specific transmission type is required by terms of a contract, order or statute, please comply with those obligations and transmit the materials by the means set forth in the agreement, order or statute as well as by email.

Confidentiality Disclosure: This information in this email and in attachments is confidential and intended solely for the attention and use of the named addressee(s). This information may be subject to attorney/client privilege or may otherwise be protected by work product privilege or other legal rules. It must not be disclosed to any person without our authority. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorized to disclose, and must not disclose, copy, distribute, or retain this message or any part of it.

This email is an informal communication that is not meant to be legally binding upon the sender unless expressly noted to the contrary.

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP, Attorneys-at-Law.

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin is fully operational in-person. However, because of anticipated delays in receiving regular mail and other deliveries, please e-mail copies of anything you send by regular mail or delivery, including issuing remittances electronically. Please contact our receptionist at reception@tarterkrinsky.com or by phone at 212-216-8000 with any questions. Thank you in advance for your courtesies.

NOTE: If regular mailing or other specific transmission type is required by terms of a contract, order or statute, please comply with those obligations and transmit the materials by the means set forth in the agreement, order or statute as well as by email.

Confidentiality Disclosure: This information in this email and in attachments is confidential and intended solely for the attention and use of the named (addressee(s)). This information may be subject to attorney/client privilege or may otherwise be protected by work product privilege or other legal rules. It must not be disclosed to any person without our authority. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorized to disclose, and must not disclose, copy, distribute, or retain this message or any part of it.

This email is an informal communication that is not meant to be legally binding upon the sender unless expressly noted to the contrary.

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP, Attorneys-at-Law.

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin is fully operational in-person. However, because of anticipated delays in receiving regular mail and other deliveries, please e-mail copies of anything you send by regular mail or delivery, including issuing remittances electronically. Please contact our receptionist at reception@tarterkrinsky.com or by phone at 212-216-8000 with any questions. Thank you in advance for your courtesies.

NOTE: If regular mailing or other specific transmission type is required by terms of a contract, order or statute, please comply with those obligations and transmit the materials by the means set forth in the agreement, order or statute as well as by email.

Confidentiality Disclosure: This information in this email and in attachments is confidential and intended solely for the attention and use of the named (addressee(s)). This information may be subject to attorney/client privilege or may otherwise be protected by work product privilege or other legal rules. It must not be disclosed to any person without our authority. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorized to disclose, and must not disclose, copy, distribute, or retain this message or any part of it.

This email is an informal communication that is not meant to be legally binding upon the sender unless expressly noted to the contrary.

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP, Attorneys-at-Law.

Exhibit 4

1 TYLER R. DOWDALL, State Bar No. 258950
tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com

2 RENATA A. GUIDRY, State Bar No. 227713
rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com

3 **TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP**

2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N

4 Los Angeles, California 90067

Telephone: (424) 330-8580

5 Facsimile: (315) 512-1465

6 BRIAN BLOOM (*pro hac vice*)

bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com

7 ELIEZER LEKHT (*pro hac vice*)

elekht@tarterkrinsky.com

8 **TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP**

1350 Broadway

9 New York, New York 10018

Telephone: (212) 574-0350

10 Facsimile: (212) 216-8001

11 *Attorneys for* Plaintiffs Sunny
Khachatryan, Tatevik Khachatryan, B.A.J,
12 a minor and I.M, a minor

13
14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
15 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
16

17 SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, an
individual; TATEVIK
18 KHACHATRYAN, an individual; B. A.
J, a minor; and I.M, a minor,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 vs.

21
22 1 HOTEL WEST HOLLYWOOD,
L.L.C.; SH GROUP OPERATIONS,
23 L.L.C.; SH GROUP GLOBAL IP
HOLDINGS, L.L.C; and DOES 1
24 through 70, inclusive,

25 Defendants.
26
27
28

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-10829-ODW(Ex)

**PLAINTIFFS SUNNY
KHACHATRYAN, AN
INDIVIDUAL; TATEVIK
KHACHATRYAN, AN
INDIVIDUAL; B. A. J, A MINOR;
AND I.M, A MINOR'S SECOND
SUPPLEMENTAL RULE 26(A)(1)
INITIAL DISCLOSURES**

Honorable Otis D. Wright II
Honorable Charles F. Eick

Complaint Filed: December 27, 2023
Trial Date: April 29, 2025

Pursuant to Rule 26(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, an individual (“S. Khachatryan”; TATEVIK KHACHATRYAN, an individual (“T. Khachatryan”); B. A. J, a minor (“B.A.J.”); and I.M, a minor, (“I.M”, collectively with S. Khachatryan; T. Khachatryan and B.A.J, known as the “Plaintiffs”), through their counsel, provides the following initial disclosures. Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend, revise or supplement these disclosures in supplemental disclosures served under Fed. R. Civ. P. Rules 26(a)(1) or 26(e)(1), in written discovery responses, in deposition testimony, or by any other means as the case progresses.

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Plaintiffs’ initial disclosures are based on information reasonably available to Plaintiffs as of the date of these disclosures. Plaintiffs’ pre-trial discovery, investigation, and analysis have not been completed, and it is anticipated further discovery, investigation, research, as well as the analysis of any existing discovery, may supply additional facts, add meaning to known facts, or establish entirely new factual conclusions. Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend or supplement these disclosures in the event Plaintiffs subsequently discovers additional relevant facts, information, or documents pursuant to Rule 26(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. By making these disclosures, Plaintiffs do not represent any particular document exists within their possession, custody, or control.

The lists of witnesses and documents set forth herein are preliminary and are neither intended nor represented to be final. Plaintiffs expressly reserve the right to identify and call as witnesses persons in addition to those listed below if during Plaintiffs’ discovery and investigation, Plaintiffs discover additional persons with knowledge of relevant facts and information.

Plaintiffs do not waive any applicable privileges, and specifically reserves those privileges including, but not limited to, the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product doctrine. These disclosures are made subject to and without

1 limiting any of the foregoing reservations.

2 **II. RULE 26(a)(1) INITIAL DISCLOSURES**

3 **A. LIST OF WITNESSES**

4 Pursuant to Rule 26(a)(1)(A)(i)—The name and, if known, the address and
5 telephone number of each individual likely to have discoverable information—along
6 with the subjects of that information—that the disclosing party may use to support his
7 or her claims or defenses, unless the use would be solely for impeachment:

Name of Person	Person's Address and Telephone Number	Description of What the Person Knows
<p>10 Sunny 11 Khachatryan, an 12 individual 13 (Plaintiff)</p>	<p>c/o TYLER R. DOWDALL tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com RENATA A. GUIDRY rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N Los Angeles, CA 90067</p> <p>BRIAN BLOOM (<i>pro hac vice</i>) bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com ELIEZER LEKHT (<i>pro hac vice</i>) elekht@tarterkrinsky.com TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP 1350 Broadway New York, New York 10018 Telephone: (212) 574-0350 Facsimile: (212) 216-8001</p>	<p>• Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint</p>
<p>21 Tatevik 22 Khachatryan, an 23 individual 24 (Plaintiff)</p>	<p>c/o TYLER R. DOWDALL tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com RENATA A. GUIDRY rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N Los Angeles, CA 90067</p> <p>BRIAN BLOOM (<i>pro hac vice</i>) bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com ELIEZER LEKHT (<i>pro hac vice</i>)</p>	<p>• Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint</p>

1		elekht@tarterkrinsky.com TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP 1350 Broadway New York, New York 10018 Telephone: (212) 574-0350 Facsimile: (212) 216-8001	
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	B.A.J., an minor (Plaintiff)	c/o TYLER R. DOWDALL tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com RENATA A. GUIDRY rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N Los Angeles, CA 90067	• Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12		BRIAN BLOOM (<i>pro hac vice</i>) bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com	
13		ELIEZER LEKHT (<i>pro hac vice</i>) elekht@tarterkrinsky.com	
14		TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP 1350 Broadway New York, New York 10018 Telephone: (212) 574-0350 Facsimile: (212) 216-8001	
15			
16			
17			
18	I.M., a minor (Plaintiff)	c/o TYLER R. DOWDALL tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com RENATA A. GUIDRY rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N Los Angeles, CA 90067	• Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint
19			
20			
21			
22			
23		BRIAN BLOOM (<i>pro hac vice</i>) bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com	
24		ELIEZER LEKHT (<i>pro hac vice</i>) elekht@tarterkrinsky.com	
25		TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP 1350 Broadway New York, New York 10018 Telephone: (212) 574-0350 Facsimile: (212) 216-8001	
26			
27			
28			

1	Stephanie Berland	DDO Agency	• Discoverable
2	– Publicis New	Att: Marlene Sutton	Knowledge
3	York	VIA E-MAIL:	regarding the
4		marlene@ddoagency.com	allegations in the
5	Recess Studios	Recess Studios LLC	operative
6	LLC	350 SE Mill St.	complaint
7		Portland, OR 97214	
8	Dick’s Sporting	Principal/Mailing Address:	• Discoverable
9	Goods, Inc.	345 Court Street	Knowledge
10		Coraopolis, PA 15108	regarding the
11		California Registered Agent SOP:	allegations in the
12		1505 Corporation	operative
13		CSC - LAWYERS	complaint
14		INCORPORATING SERVICE	
15		2710 GATEWAY OAKS DRIVE,	
16	The Gap, Inc.	SACRAMENTO, CA	
17		Principal:	• Discoverable
18		2 Folsom Street	Knowledge
19		San Francisco, California 94105	regarding the
20		Mailing Address:	allegations in the
21		PO Box 27809; Attn: Annual	operative
22		Reports	complaint
23		Albuquerque, New Mexico 87125	
24		CA Agent SOP:	
25		1505 Corporation	
26	Talent Agent:	CT Corporation System	
27	Celith Santiago	330 N. Brand Blvd.	
28		Glendale, California	
		Contact information unknown;	• Discoverable
		Plaintiff will supplement this	Knowledge
		disclosure should contact	regarding the
		information be obtained.	allegations in the
			operative

		complaint
Boot Barn, Inc.	Principal/Mailing Address: 15345 Barranca Parkway Irvine, CA 92618 Phone: 949.453.4400 Fax: 949.453.4401 CA Agent SOP: 1505 Corporation CSC - LAWYERS INCORPORATING SERVICE 2710 Gateway Oaks Drive Sacramento, CA	• Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint
Levi Strauss & Co.	Principal/Mailing Address: 1155 Battery Street San Francisco, California 94111	• Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint
Mhair Zeitounian, Reload Management	Reload Management (818) 636-6813 mhair@reloadmanagement.com	• Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint
Abercrombie & Fitch Management Co.	Principal/Mailing Address: 6301 Fitch Path New Albany, Ohio 43054 CA Agent SOP: 330 N. Brand Blvd. Glendale, California	• Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint
What's Your Starch LLC as agent for Starch Creative, LT, Adidas, and other third party companies	Principal/Mailing Address/CA Agent SOP: 1010 W. 17 th St. Costa Mesa, California 92627	• Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint

<p>Amsel, Eisenstadt, Frazier & Hinojosa Inc (“AEFH”)</p>	<p>Katie Kessler Assistant to Nicole Jolley, Milton Perea & Katelyn Giroux Amsel, Eisenstadt, Frazier & Hinojosa Inc. 5055 Wilshire Blvd. Suite 865 Los Angeles, CA 90036 o- 323-939-1188 x.1021 f- 323-939-0630 assistant@aeftalent.com</p> <p>CA Agent SOP: Michael E. Eisenstadt 5055 Wilshire Blvd. Suite 865 Los Angeles, CA 90036</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint
<p>LA MODELS JUNIOR</p>	<p>Jackie Hau Director Junior Division 7700 West Sunset Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90046 P: 323 436 7700 C: 323 352 4187</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint
<p>LA TALENT</p>	<p>Jeremy Apody / Director of Youth Talent 7700 W Sunset Blvd Los Angeles, CA 90046 P: 323-436-7777 Ext. 2046 F: 323-436-7788 japody@latalent.com</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint
<p>PALOMA MODELS AND TALENT</p>	<p>Paloma Jackson 323-800-7500 paloma@palomamodelandtalent.com</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint
<p>DDO KIDS</p>	<p>Bri Curtis Youth Division Agent P:323-462-8000 bri@ddoagency.com</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint

	4605 Lankershim Blvd, Suite 340, North Hollywood, CA 91602	
Person Most Knowledgeable at SH Hotels & Resorts, (Person Most Knowledgeable for Defendants)	c/o Defendants' counsel of record	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discoverable Knowledge regarding the allegations in the operative complaint

B. LIST OF DOCUMENTS AND THINGS

Plaintiffs identify the following categories of documents that Plaintiffs presently believe they may use to support their claims. This information is based on Plaintiffs' investigation to date, which is ongoing and Plaintiffs specifically reserve the right to identify additional categories and locations of documents as discovery proceeds:

Category of Documents	Location of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents relating to Defendants' defenses. Documents relating to Defendants' posting and use of the photograph; Inventory and sales of the products depicted in the photograph Defendants' internal communications regarding use of the photographs 	SH Hotels & Resorts c/o Clark Hill LLP 600 West Broadway, Suite 500 San Diego CA 92101
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents relating to Plaintiffs' modeling work 	c/o Tarter Krinsky & Drogin, LLP 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N Los Angeles, CA 90067

Plaintiffs expressly reserve the right to amend or supplement these responses to reflect information acquired through discovery or other means.

C. PLAINTIFFS/CLAIMANTS: DAMAGES CALCULATION

Rule 26(a)(1)(A)(iii)—A computation of each category of damages claimed by the disclosing party, who must also make available for inspection and copying as under Rule 34 the documents or other evidentiary material (unless privileged or protected from disclosure) on which each computation is based, including materials bearing on the nature and extent of injuries suffered:

Plaintiffs seek monetary relief of actual damages in the amount of \$2,000,000.

D. DEFENDANT(S): LIABILITY INSURANCE

Rule 26(a)(1)(A)(iv)—For inspection and copying as under Rule 34, any insurance agreement under which an insurance business may be liable to satisfy all or part of a possible judgment in the action or to indemnify or reimburse for payments made to satisfy the judgment:

Plaintiffs are unaware of any insurance.

III. CERTIFICATION

The undersigned counsel certifies under Rule 26(g)(1)(A) to the best of their knowledge, information, and belief, formed after a reasonable inquiry, that these disclosures are complete and correct as of this date.

(Attorney signatures on following page)

1 DATED: June 21, 2024

TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP

2
3
4 By: /s/ Brian Bloom

5 Tyler R. Dowdall, State Bar No. 258950

6 tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com

7 Renata A. Guidry, State Bar No. 227713

8 rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com

9 **TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP**

10 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N

11 Los Angeles, California 90067

12 Telephone: (424) 330-8580

13 Facsimile: (315) 512-1465

14 Brian Bloom (*pro hac vice*)

15 bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com

16 Eliezer Lekht (*pro hac vice*)

17 elekht@tarterkrinsky.com

18 **TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP**

19 1350 Broadway

20 New York, New York 10018

21 Telephone: (212) 574-0350

22 Facsimile: (212) 216-8001

23
24
25
26
27
28 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs* Sunny Khachatryan,
Tatevik Khachatryan, B.A.J, a minor and I.M, a
minor

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

**SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, an individual, et al. v. 1 HOTEL WEST
HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and **not a party to this action**. I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. My business address is 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N, Los Angeles, CA 90067.

On June 21, 2024, I served true copies of the following document(s) described as **PLAINTIFFS SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, AN INDIVIDUAL; TATEVIK KHACHATRYAN, AN INDIVIDUAL; B. A. J, A MINOR; AND I.M, A MINOR'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RULE 26(A)(1) INITIAL DISCLOSURES** on the interested parties in this action as follows:

CLARK HILL LLP
Myriah Jaworski
mjaworski@clarkhill.com

One America Plaza
600 West Broadway, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 557-0404
Facsimile: (619) 557-0460

Attorneys for Defendants 1
HOTEL WESTHOLLYWOOD,
L.L.C.; SH GROUP
OPERATIONS, L.L.C.;
SH GROUP GLOBAL IP
HOLDINGS, L.L.C.

BY E-MAIL OR ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION: I caused a copy of the document(s) to be sent from e-mail address BGenser@tarterkrinsky.com to the persons at the e-mail addresses listed in the Service List. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on June 21, 2024, at Los Angeles, California.

/s/ Brooke M. Genser

Brooke M. Genser

Exhibit 5

Dolce, Nicolas

From: Jaworski, Myriah
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2024 10:43 AM
To: Tyler R. Dowdall; Brian A. Bloom; Dolce, Nicolas
Cc: Eliezer Lekht; Lisa Niewdach; Patel, Chirag; Brooke Genser
Subject: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Discovery, Disclosures, Notice of Depo
Attachments: SH Group- Dep Notice_S.Khachatryan.pdf

Counsel,

First, we look forward to Plaintiffs responses and production to defendants discovery demands, which are due July 15.

Next, attached is a notice of deposition for Sunny Khachatryan, which is being served today. We would like to schedule her deposition in early August. Please provide us with some proposed dates.

Last, Plaintiffs' damages disclosures under Rule 26(a)(1)(A)(iii) remain incomplete.

Plaintiffs' Second Supplemental Rule 26 Initial Disclosures simply states: **"Plaintiffs seek monetary relief of actual damages in the amount of \$2,000,000"** – this is defective under law. *Spin Master, Ltd. v. Zobmondo Ent., LLC*, No. CV063459ABCPLAX, 2011 WL 13127349, n.12 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2011), *on reconsideration in part*, No. CV063459ABCPLAX, 2011 WL 13127211 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 13, 2011) ("category of 'actual damages' is meaningless as a 'category' because it says nothing about the type of actual damages sought.").

Rule 26 computations require that the Plaintiff provide an analysis of alleged damages; enough so that the opposing party can "understand the contours of its potential exposure and make informed decisions as to settlement and discovery." *City & Cty. of San Francisco v. Tutor-Saliba Corp.*, 218 F.R.D. 219, 221 (N.D. Cal. 2003); see also *Frontline Med. Assocs., Inc. v. Coventry Health Care*, 263 F.R.D. 567, 570 (C.D. Cal. 2009) (finding insufficient disclosure of damages based on "lost referrals" because the plaintiff provided "no computation whatsoever" for that category).

The lump sum total provided by Plaintiffs is improper, and Defendant is unable to properly analyze the alleged claims and damages exposure – an approach which has been explicitly rejected by courts. See *Tutor-Saliba Corp.*, 218 F.R.D. at 221–22 (rejecting plaintiffs' aggregation of all compensatory damages for all claims, requiring instead that the plaintiffs distribute their damages among the several contracts at issue and among their separate claims).

Please provide Defendants with a complete and sufficient damages computation, outlining the exact damages Plaintiffs seek, to us not later than this **Wednesday, July 12**.

Defendants reserve all rights, including under Rule 37, to move to prohibit the use at trial of any information required to be disclosed by Rule 26(a) that is not properly disclosed.

Thanks,
Myriah

From: Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2024 12:25 AM
To: Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>; Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>; Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>
Cc: Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Patel, Chirag

<cpatel@clarkhill.com>; Brooke Genser <bgsenser@tarterkrinsky.com>

Subject: RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

[External Message]

Myriah,

Please see the attached. We'll formally serve this tomorrow.



Tyler R. Dowdall | Partner

T: 424-330-8580 | F: 212-216-8001

tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com | Bio

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP

2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N | Los Angeles | CA | 90067

www.tarterkrinsky.com | LinkedIn

Crain's 2023 best places to work in NYC

From: Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>

Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 8:40 AM

To: Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>; Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>

Cc: Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>

Subject: [EXT] RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

Brian – we expect the updated supplemental disclosures from plaintiffs by COB today.

Thanks,
Myriah

From: Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>

Sent: Thursday, June 6, 2024 12:24 PM

To: Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>; Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>

Cc: Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>; Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>

Subject: RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

[External Message]

Myriah –

We just received the requested information from our clients this week and will be sending over supplemental disclosures to you shortly. We apologize for the delay but do not believe your client has been harmed. We certainly conducted our due diligence before filing our Complaint. Your client certainly did NOT take appropriate precautions before using our minor client's images publicly for its own commercial gain.

All rights remain reserved.

All the best,
Brian



Brian A. Bloom | Partner
T: 212-574-0350 | T: 516-464-3570 | M: 516-330-8123
bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com | Bio
Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP
1350 Broadway | New York | NY | 10018
www.tarterkrinsky.com | LinkedIn

Crain's 2023 best places to work in NYC

From: Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 6, 2024 12:19 PM
To: Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>; Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>
Cc: Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>
Subject: [EXT] RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

Brian,

One month ago, on May 9, we wrote to you to request that the Khachatryan plaintiffs update their initial disclosures to include the identities and contact information for the branding deals, modeling contracts, and talent agents with whom the minor children allegedly have contracts – including specifically the identity of those involved in consideration of the minors' "multi-million dollar hotel endorsement" and contacts with "several five star hotel chains." Comp'l. ¶ 7. As you know, this information is the basis for Plaintiffs' claims, and specifically their calculation of potential damages. This information is discoverable, relevant, and fundamental to SH Group's defenses.

On May 21 we followed up regarding the status of this information, and specifically asked to meet and confer on the issue. We were told that you were "waiting for further information from the clients" and would respond to us shortly. On May 27, we followed up again regarding our request, and have not received a response from you.

There is no justification for your failure to provide this information to us. First, this information should already be known to you in connection with your Rule 11 and other ethical obligations to conduct due diligences on these third-party contracts **before** including such allegations in the complaint. See *Refac Int'l, Ltd. v. Hitachi Ltd.*, 141 F.R.D. 281 (C.D. Cal. 1991) (finding that counsel violated its affirmative duty to investigate before a paper is filed with the court and sanctions were expressly required under Rule 11); see also *Truesdell v. S. Calif. Permanente Med. Group*, 209 F.R.D. 169, 173-73 (C.D. Cal. 2002). Thus, this information should be within your possession, readily available and capable of disclosure, and not something that is only now being "run down" by you with your clients.

Second, your failure to timely provide this information is also harmful to SH Group, which has the right to investigate these allegations, present a defense, and prepare for trial. As you know, the parties are subject to the Court's ordered discovery schedule, which includes a Fall 2024 fact discovery cut-off date. Among other things, your failure to timely disclose this information is preventing SH Group from serving necessary third-party document requests, interrogatories and deposition notices.

Thus, I am writing for a final time to request that Plaintiffs supplement their initial disclosures as requested by SH Group's May 9 correspondence, no later than close of business on **Monday, June 10**.

SH Group reserves all rights and remedies regarding this issue, including the right to seek discovery and case-dispositive sanctions and Rule 11 sanctions against all counsel of record.

Thanks,
Myriah

From: Jaworski, Myriah
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2024 1:07 PM
To: Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>; Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>
Cc: Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>
Subject: RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

Tyler,

When can we expect this information?

Thanks,
Myriah

From: Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 12:14 PM
To: Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>; Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>
Cc: Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>
Subject: RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

[External Message]

Nicolas,

Thanks for the follow up.

We are waiting for further information from the clients and will get back to you.

Thanks,



Tyler R. Dowdall | Partner
T: 424-330-8580 | F: 212-216-8001
tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com | Bio
Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP
2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N | Los Angeles | CA | 90067
www.tarterkrinsky.com | LinkedIn

Crain's 2023 best places to work in NYC

From: Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 8:20 AM
To: Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>
Cc: Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>
Subject: [EXT] RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

Counsel,

I am following up on Defendants' previously issued discovery correspondence, reattached here for convenience. Given the lack of response to Defendants' correspondence, we request to meet and confer on Plaintiffs' deficient disclosures. Please propose some dates and times that you are available to confer either this week or next.

Respectfully,

Nicolas V. Dolce

Attorney at Law

Clark Hill

130 E. Randolph Street, Suite 3900, Chicago, IL 60601

+1 312.360.2113 (office) | +1 312.517.7580 (fax)

ndolce@clarkhill.com | www.clarkhill.com

From: Dolce, Nicolas

Sent: Thursday, May 9, 2024 12:22 PM

To: Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>

Cc: Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>

Subject: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Defendants' Discovery Deficiency Correspondence

Counsel,

Pursuant to Local Rule 37-1, please find attached Defendants' discovery correspondence concerning deficiencies in Plaintiffs' Rule 26 initial disclosures.

Respectfully,

Nicolas V. Dolce

Attorney at Law

Clark Hill

130 E. Randolph Street, Suite 3900, Chicago, IL 60601

+1 312.360.2113 (office) | +1 312.517.7580 (fax)

ndolce@clarkhill.com | www.clarkhill.com

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin is fully operational in-person. However, because of anticipated delays in receiving regular mail and other deliveries, please e-mail copies of anything you send by regular mail or delivery, including issuing remittances electronically. Please contact our receptionist at reception@tarterkrinsky.com or by phone at 212-216-8000 with any questions. Thank you in advance for your courtesies.

NOTE: If regular mailing or other specific transmission type is required by terms of a contract, order or statute, please comply with those obligations and transmit the materials by the means set forth in the agreement, order or statute as well as by email.

Confidentiality Disclosure: This information in this email and in attachments is confidential and intended solely for the attention and use of the named addressee(s). This information may be subject to attorney/client privilege or may otherwise be protected by work product privilege or other legal rules. It must not be disclosed to any person without our authority. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorized to disclose, and must not disclose, copy, distribute, or retain this message or any part of it.

This email is an informal communication that is not meant to be legally binding upon the sender unless expressly noted to the contrary.

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP, Attorneys-at-Law.

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin is fully operational in-person. However, because of anticipated delays in receiving regular mail and other deliveries, please e-mail copies of anything you send by regular mail or delivery, including issuing remittances electronically. Please contact our receptionist at reception@tarterkrinsky.com or by phone at 212-216-8000 with any questions. Thank you in advance for your courtesies.

NOTE: If regular mailing or other specific transmission type is required by terms of a contract, order or statute, please comply with those obligations and transmit the materials by the means set forth in the agreement, order or statute as well as by email.

Confidentiality Disclosure: This information in this email and in attachments is confidential and intended solely for the attention and use of the named (addressee(s)). This information may be subject to attorney/client privilege or may otherwise be protected by work product privilege or other legal rules. It must not be disclosed to any person without our authority. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorized to disclose, and must not disclose, copy, distribute, or retain this message or any part of it.

This email is an informal communication that is not meant to be legally binding upon the sender unless expressly noted to the contrary.

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP, Attorneys-at-Law.

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin is fully operational in-person. However, because of anticipated delays in receiving regular mail and other deliveries, please e-mail copies of anything you send by regular mail or delivery, including issuing remittances electronically. Please contact our receptionist at reception@tarterkrinsky.com or by phone at 212-216-8000 with any questions. Thank you in advance for your courtesies.

NOTE: If regular mailing or other specific transmission type is required by terms of a contract, order or statute, please comply with those obligations and transmit the materials by the means set forth in the agreement, order or statute as well as by email.

Confidentiality Disclosure: This information in this email and in attachments is confidential and intended solely for the attention and use of the named (addressee(s)). This information may be subject to attorney/client privilege or may otherwise be protected by work product privilege or other legal rules. It must not be disclosed to any person without our authority. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorized to disclose, and must not disclose, copy, distribute, or retain this message or any part of it.

This email is an informal communication that is not meant to be legally binding upon the sender unless expressly noted to the contrary.

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP, Attorneys-at-Law.

Exhibit 6

CLARK HILL LLP
Myriah Jaworski (SBN 336898)
mjaworski@clarkhill.com
One America Plaza
600 West Broadway, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 557-0404
Facsimile: (619) 557-0460

Attorneys for Defendants 1 HOTEL WEST
HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.; SH GROUP OPERATIONS,
L.L.C.; SH GROUP GLOBAL IP HOLDINGS, L.L.C.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, AN
INDIVIDUAL; TATEVIK
KHACHATRYAN, AN INDIVIDUAL;
BRAVE ANGELO JOHNSON, A
MINOR; AND ISABELLA MURRAY,
A MINOR,

Plaintiffs,

v.

1 HOTEL WEST HOLLYWOOD,
L.L.C.; SH GROUP OPERATIONS,
L.L.C.; SH GROUP GLOBAL IP
HOLDINGS, L.L.C.; AND DOES 1
THROUGH 70, INCLUSIVE,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-10829-ODW-E

**DEFENDANTS 1 HOTEL WEST
HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.; SH GROUP
OPERATIONS, L.L.C.; SH GROUP
GLOBAL IP HOLDINGS, L.L.C.'S
FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES
TO PLAINTIFF SUNNY
KHACHATRYAN**

Pursuant to Rule 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendants
1Hotel West Hollywood, L.L.C.; SH Group Operations, L.L.C.; and SH Group
Global IP Holdings, L.L.C. (collectively, "Defendants"), through its counsel,
requires that Plaintiff Sunny Khachatryan provide full and complete answers, in
writing and under oath, to the following interrogatories within 30 days of the date of
service hereof:

INSTRUCTIONS

A. All interrogatories shall be answered as required by Rule 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure within thirty (30) days of service of these interrogatories.

B. In responding to these requests and interrogatories, you are required to divulge all information and/or documents which are in the possession, custody, or control of You, Your attorneys, investigators, agents, employees, or other representatives, or their agents or persons or entities acting or purporting to act on Your or their behalf. In responding, you must furnish all information available.

C. If you cannot answer any interrogatory set forth herein in full, after exercising due diligence to secure the information, so state and answer to the fullest extent possible, specifying the reasons for Your inability to answer the remainder and stating whatever information or knowledge You have concerning the unanswered portion.

D. If an answer or portion thereof to any request or interrogatory set forth herein is based upon information and belief, rather than actual knowledge, the answer should so state, and the source or sources upon which such information and belief are based should be specifically described and identified.

E. If You object to any request or interrogatory set forth herein, state the reasons for the objection with specificity.

F. If you object to any interrogatory or any portion of an interrogatory on the ground that the answer reflects or would reveal the substance of a privileged communication, identify:

- (a) the nature of the privilege claimed;
- (b) the person who made the communication, whether oral or in writing;
- (c) if the communication was oral, all persons present while the communication was made;
- (d) if the communication was written, the author, addressees, and any other

1 recipients;

2 (e) the relationship of the author of the communication to each recipient;

3 (f) the relationship of the persons present to the person who made the
4 communication;

5 (g) the date and place of the communication; and

6 (h) the general subject matter of the communication.

7 G. If you respond to an interrogatory by reference to documents pursuant
8 to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d), identify the documents with specificity,
9 including by identifying the applicable Bates Number range to the extent the
10 documents are produced in response to document requests in this proceeding.

11 H. Where reference is made to any date or figure, in addition to the date or
12 figure specified, the reference is intended to connote an approximation unless
13 otherwise stated.

14 I. Wherever the singular form of a noun is used, it is intended to and does
15 apply as well to the plural form of the noun. Whenever the plural form of a noun is
16 used, it is intended to and does apply as well to the singular form of the noun unless
17 otherwise specified.

18 J. Where an individual interrogatory calls for an answer which involves
19 more than one part, each part of the answer should be clearly set out so that it is
20 understandable.

21 K. For the convenience of the parties, each interrogatory should be quoted
22 in full immediately preceding the response.

23 L. These interrogatories are continuing requests and require that You
24 supplement Your answers setting forth any and all information within the scope of
25 each request and interrogatory as may be acquired by You, Your agents, attorneys
26 or representatives following the service of Your original answers.

27

28

DEFINITIONS

1
2 1. “Defendants” means Defendants 1Hotel West Hollywood, L.L.C., SH
3 Group Operations, L.L.C., and SH Group Global IP Holdings, L.L.C., the
4 Defendants in the above-captioned proceeding.

5 2. “Plaintiff”, “you,” or “your” means Plaintiff Sunny Khachatryan.

6 3. “Plaintiffs” means Plaintiffs Sunny Khachatryan, Tatevik Khachatryan,
7 B.A.J., and I.M.

8 4. “Concerning” means consisting of, referring to, relating to, reflecting,
9 or being in any way logically or factually connected with the matter discussed.

10 5. “Communication” means the transmittal of information (in the form of
11 facts, ideas, inquiries, or otherwise).

12 6. “Date” means the exact day, month, and year if ascertainable, or, if not,
13 the best available approximation (including relationship to other events).

14 7. “Describe” means set forth fully and unambiguously every fact relevant
15 to the subject of the interrogatory, of which you (including your agents and
16 representatives) have knowledge or information.

17 8. “Document” is synonymous in meaning and equal in scope to its usage
18 in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34(a)(1)(A). The term “document” refers to any
19 document now or at any time in Plaintiff’s possession, custody, or control. A person
20 is deemed in control of a document if the person has any ownership, possession, or
21 custody of the document, or the right to secure the document or a copy thereof from
22 any person or public or private entity having physical possession thereof.

23 9. “Identify” with respect to a person who is an individual means to state
24 that person’s full name, present or last known address, and current or last known
25 place of employment.

26 10. “Identify” with respect to a person that is not an individual means to
27 state its: full name, legal form, date of organization, state of incorporation or
28 organization or other business or license authority, present or last known address and

1 telephone number, and the identity of its chief executive officer, partners, or persons
2 in equivalent positions.

3 11. “Identify” with respect to a document means to give, to the extent
4 known, the (a) type of document; (b) general subject matter; (c) date of the
5 document; and (d) author(s), addressee(s) and recipient(s). In the alternative, the
6 responding party may produce the documents, together with identifying information
7 sufficient to satisfy Rule 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

8 12. “Identify” with respect to communications means to give, to the extent
9 known, (a) a description of the substance of the communication; (b) the form of the
10 communication (e.g., telephone, facsimile, email, etc.); (c) the identity of each
11 person that was a party to and/or present at the time of the communication, as well
12 as the full name, present or last known address, and the current or last known place
13 of employment of each person; (d) the identity of the person whom you contend
14 initiated the communication; and (e) the time, date, and place of the communication.

15 13. “Minor Plaintiffs” means Plaintiffs B.A.J., a minor, and I.M, a minor.

16 14. “Photograph” means the photograph created on or about January 3,
17 2021, and at issue in the Complaint. *See* Compl. ¶16, *et. seq.*

18 15. The term “person” means any natural person or any legal entity,
19 including, but not limited to, any business or governmental entity, organization, or
20 association.

21 16. The terms “and” and “or” shall be construed either conjunctively or
22 disjunctively as necessary to bring within the scope of the interrogatory all responses
23 that might otherwise fall outside the scope of this interrogatory.

24 17. The term “identity” refers to any attribute of an individual to an
25 ordinary, reasonable viewer or listener, including but not limited to (i) name, (ii)
26 signature, (iii) photograph, (iv) (v) signature, (vi) photograph, (vii) image, (viii)
27 address, or (ix) family member identity information.

28 18. The terms “all,” “any,” or “each” encompass any and all of the matter

1 discussed.

2 19. The use of singular form includes plural, and vice versa.

3 20. The use of present tense includes past tense, and vice versa.

4 21. The masculine form shall also be construed to include the feminine and
5 vice versa.

6 **INTERROGATORIES**

7 1. State the full name, current residence address, date of birth, current
8 telephone number, and Social Security number of the persons responding to these
9 interrogatories.

10 **RESPONSE:**

11 2. Identify all documents which concern, refer or relate to, or support the
12 allegations of the Complaint.

13 **RESPONSE:**

14 3. As to all damages Plaintiffs claim they has incurred:

15 a. state in detail the factual basis and amount, and

16 b. identify all documents which support Plaintiffs claims for
17 statutory damages, attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs
18 of suit.

19 c. identify all documents which support Plaintiffs claims for actual
20 damages.

21 **RESPONSE:**

22 4. Identify all persons who may have any personal knowledge regarding
23 the allegations contained in the Complaint and state the substance of each person's
24 knowledge.

25 **RESPONSE:**

26 5. Identify all persons whom Plaintiffs intend to call as a witness at trial,
27 any hearing or deposition in this matter, and for each person identified, identify the
28 matters about which the witness will testify.

1 **RESPONSE:**

2 6. Has Plaintiff ever been a party to any lawsuit? If so, list the name, court
3 number, jurisdiction and outcome for all such lawsuits, including but not limited to
4 all bankruptcy filings that Plaintiff has filed within the last ten years, including the
5 case number and jurisdiction for each such filing and the dates each bankruptcy was
6 closed.

7 **RESPONSE:**

8 7. Has Plaintiff ever been convicted of:

- 9 a. crime punishable by imprisonment in excess of 1 year, or
10 b. a crime involving dishonesty or false statement? If yes, please
11 list the case name, number, jurisdiction and outcome.
12 c. A bankruptcy or tax proceeding? If yes, please list the case name,
13 number, jurisdiction and outcome.

14 **RESPONSE:**

15 8. Identify each and every person involved in posting the Photograph to
16 Instagram as alleged in Paragraph 19 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

17 **RESPONSE:**

18 9. Describe all facts supporting the allegations in Paragraph 20 of
19 Plaintiffs' Complaint that the Photograph contained "copyright management
20 information".

21 **RESPONSE:**

22 10. Identify each and every person involved in the Instagram messaging
23 communications with Defendants contained in Paragraphs 7 through 10 of
24 Defendants' Affirmative Defenses.

25 **RESPONSE:**

26 11. Describe all facts supporting the allegations contained in Paragraph 5
27 of Plaintiffs' Complaint regarding Minor Plaintiffs' appearance in "television
28 commercials, print ads, and other paid commercial uses of their images and

1 likeness.” State with specificity each commercial, ad or other paid use of their
2 image(s) from January 1, 2020 through present day, and provide the relevant
3 payment and terms for each.

4 **RESPONSE:**

5 12. Describe all facts supporting the allegations contained in Paragraph 5
6 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint regarding Minor Plaintiffs’ modeling contracts with Adidas.

7 **RESPONSE:**

8 13. Describe all facts supporting the allegations contained in Paragraph 17
9 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint regarding Minor Plaintiffs’ multiple modeling contracts for
10 “several five-star hotel chains” and consideration for a “multi-million-dollar hotel
11 endorsement”.

12 **RESPONSE:**

13 14. State all social media accounts that You have had from January 1, 2020,
14 through the present (e.g. Facebook, Twitter (or X), Instagram, Snapchat, Google+,
15 etc.) and, for each, state when You first created the account.

16 **RESPONSE:**

17 15. State all social media accounts that Minor Plaintiffs have had from
18 January 1, 2020, through the present (e.g. Facebook, Twitter (or X), Instagram,
19 Snapchat, Google+, etc.) and, for each, state when and who first created the account.

20 **RESPONSE:**

21 16. Describe each and every website or social media account that You own,
22 operate, or which is operated on Plaintiffs behalf.

23 **RESPONSE:**

24 17. Describe in detail how and when Plaintiffs first identified the
25 Photograph on Defendants’ website.

26 **RESPONSE:**

27 18. Describe in detail any and all profits, wages, or other compensation
28 Minor Plaintiffs have received from January 1, 2020, through present.

RESPONSE:

Dated: June 14, 2024

CLARK HILL LLP

By: /s/ Myriah V. Jaworski
Myriah V. Jaworski (SBN 336898)

Attorneys for Defendants 1 HOTEL
WEST HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.; SH
GROUP OPERATIONS, L.L.C.; SH
GROUP GLOBAL IP HOLDINGS,
L.L.C

Exhibit 7

1 TYLER R. DOWDALL, State Bar No. 258950
tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com

2 RENATA A. GUIDRY, State Bar No. 227713
rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com

3 **TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP**

2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N

4 Los Angeles, California 90067

Telephone: (424) 330-8580

5 Facsimile: (315) 512-1465

6 BRIAN BLOOM (*pro hac vice*)

bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com

7 ELIEZER LEKHT (*pro hac vice*)

elekht@tarterkrinsky.com

8 **TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP**

1350 Broadway

9 New York, New York 10018

Telephone: (212) 574-0350

10 Facsimile: (212) 216-8001

11 *Attorneys for* Plaintiffs Sunny
Khachatryan, Tatevik Khachatryan, B.A.J,
12 a minor and I.M, a minor

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
14 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

15
16 SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, an
individual; TATEVIK
17 KHACHATRYAN, an individual; B. A.
J, a minor; and I.M, a minor,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 vs.

20
21 1 HOTEL WEST HOLLYWOOD,
L.L.C.; SH GROUP OPERATIONS,
22 L.L.C.; SH GROUP GLOBAL IP
HOLDINGS, L.L.C; and DOES 1
23 through 70, inclusive,

24 Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-10829-ODW(Ex)

**PLAINTIFF SUNNY
KHACHATRYAN, AN
INDIVIDUAL, RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANTS 1 HOTEL WEST
HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.; SH GROUP
OPERATIONS, L.L.C.; SH GROUP
GLOBAL IP HOLDINGS, L.L.C.'S
FIRST SET OF
INTERROGATORIES TO
PLAINTIFF SUNNY
KHACHATRYAN**

1 PROPOUNDING PARTY: 1 HOTEL WEST HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.; SH
2 GROUP OPERATIONS, L.L.C.; SH GROUP
3 GLOBAL IP HOLDINGS, L.L.C
4 RESPONDING PARTY: PLAINTIFF SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, AN
5 INDIVIDUAL
6 SET NO.: ONE
7 INTERROGATORY NOS.: 1–18

8 Pursuant to Rules 26 and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff
9 Sunny Khachatryan (“Responding Party”) hereby submits these objections and
10 responses to the First Set of Interrogatories propounded by Defendants 1Hotel West
11 Hollywood, L.L.C.; SH Group Operations, L.L.C.; and SH Group Global IP Holdings,
12 L.L.C. (collectively, "Defendants") (“Propounding Party”) as follows:

13 **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

14 Responding Party’s investigation, discovery and analysis are ongoing, and
15 Responding Party’s response to each of these Interrogatories is based on information
16 and documents presently available to Responding Party after reasonable inquiry.
17 Responding Party reserves the right to supplement or amend these responses in the
18 event further information and/or documents are disclosed or discovered. In addition,
19 Responding Party’s responses are given without prejudice to its right to introduce as
20 evidence at trial any subsequently discovered or unintentionally omitted information
21 and/or documents.

22 Specific objections to each of these Interrogatories are made on an individual
23 basis in the responses below. In addition to these specific objects, Responding Party
24 makes certain continuing objections (“General Objections”) to the Interrogatories.
25 These General Objections are hereby incorporated by reference into the responses
26 made with respect to each separate interrogatory. For particular emphasis,
27 Responding Party has, from time to time, expressly included one or more of the
28 General Objections in certain of its response below. Responding Party’s response to

1 each individual interrogatory is submitted without prejudice to, and without in any
2 respect waiving, any General Objections not expressly set forth in that response.
3 Accordingly, the inclusion of any specific objection in a response to an interrogatory
4 below is neither intended as, nor shall in any way be deemed to be, a waiver of any
5 General Objections or of any specific objection made herein or that may be asserted
6 at a later date. In addition, the failure to include at this time any continuing or specific
7 objection to an interrogatory is neither intended as, nor shall in any way be deemed
8 to be, a waiver of Responding Party's right to assert that or any other objection at a
9 later date.

10 No incidental or implied admissions are intended by the responses herein.
11 Responding Party's response and/or objections to a particular interrogatory shall not
12 be taken as an admission that Responding Party accepts or admits the existence of
13 any "fact" set forth in or assumed by that interrogatory.

14 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

15 Responding Party makes the following General Objections to Defendants'
16 Interrogatories, including without limitation, the Instructions and Definitions set
17 forth therein, whether or not separately set forth in each response to each individual
18 interrogatory:

19 1. Responding Party objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they seek
20 information protected by any relevant privilege or legal protection, including,
21 without limitation, the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the joint
22 defense privilege, the settlement or settlement negotiation privilege, settlement
23 materials, or trial preparation materials. Any statement herein to the effect that
24 Responding Party will provide information in response to an interrogatory is limited
25 to information that does not fall within the scope of any relevant privilege.

26 2. Responding Party objects to any requirement that it identify or provide
27 a list of any materials withheld from discovery pursuant to either the attorney-client
28 communications privilege and/or the attorney work product immunity and which

1 materials were created on or after December 27, 2023, the date on which this lawsuit
2 was filed. Such a requirement would be unduly burdensome and would interfere with
3 Responding Party's defense of this lawsuit by deterring the creation of such
4 documents.

5 3. Responding Party objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they seek
6 information that is irrelevant to any claim or defense and not reasonably calculated
7 to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

8 4. Responding Party objects to the Interrogatories on the grounds that they
9 are vague, ambiguous, and use unlimited, undefined, subjective or open-ended terms
10 or phrases.

11 5. Responding Party objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that the
12 purported benefit of the discovery sought by the Interrogatories is outweighed by the
13 burden and expense of responding to the Interrogatories pursuant to Rules 26(b)(1)
14 and 26(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

15 6. Responding Party objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they
16 purport to require complete responses from Responding Party within 30 days of
17 service. Responding Party's investigation of the claims and defenses at issue in this
18 Action is continuing, and Responding Party expressly reserves the right to
19 supplement these responses as necessary.

20 7. Responding Party objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they
21 attempt to impose burdens on Responding Party inconsistent with, or in excess of,
22 the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Central District of
23 California Local Rules, or any applicable orders of this Court.

24 8. Responding Party objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they seek
25 information unknown to Responding Party, that refers to persons, entities or events
26 not known to Responding Party, or that relates to documents not within Responding
27 Party's possession, custody, or control. Such a requirement would exceed
28 Responding Party's obligations under the Federal Rules and applicable Local Rules

1 and would subject Responding Party to unreasonable and undue oppression, burden
2 and expense. In responding to these Interrogatories, Responding Party shall respond
3 only on behalf of itself and shall not undertake the burden and expense of attempting
4 to provide information presently unknown to Responding Party or relating to
5 documents outside Responding Party's possession, custody, or control.

6 9. Responding Party objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they
7 seek publicly-available information, or information that is equally available to
8 Plaintiff from sources other than Responding Party, on the grounds that such
9 Interrogatories are unduly burdensome, oppressive, and harassing.

10 10. Responding Party objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they call
11 for legal conclusions or contain express or implied assumptions of fact or law with
12 respect to matters at issue in this Action. Nothing in Responding Party's responses
13 or objections may be construed to reflect an agreement or concurrence by
14 Responding Party with Plaintiff's characterizations of any factual or legal issues.
15 Responding Party expressly reserves the right to contest any such characterization as
16 inaccurate and to provide and supplement its legal contentions in an appropriate
17 format on an appropriate schedule.

18 11. Responding Party objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they fail to
19 specify a relevant time period, or to the extent any specified time period is irrelevant
20 to any claim or defense at issue in this Action, on the grounds that the Interrogatories
21 are overly broad, unduly burdensome, and seek information that is neither relevant
22 nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

23 12. Responding Party objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they fail to
24 specify a relevant geographic area, or to the extent any specified geographic area is
25 irrelevant to any claim or defense at issue in this Action, on the grounds that the
26 Interrogatories are overly broad, unduly burdensome, and seek information that is
27 neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
28 evidence.

1 13. Responding Party objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they seek
2 “all” documents or communications relating to a particular topic or category of
3 information on the grounds that the Interrogatories are overly broad, unduly
4 burdensome, and seek information that is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated
5 to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

6 14. Responding Party objects to Plaintiff’s definition of the terms “YOU”
7 and “YOUR” as vague and ambiguous, especially to the extent it seeks discovery
8 regarding Responding Party’s “including its agents, attorneys, investigators,
9 affiliates and/or representatives, and any other person or entity who at any time has
10 acted or purported to act on behalf of Responding Party Sunny Khachatryan, and any
11 person answering these Requests.” Responding Party also objects to this definition
12 as overly broad and exceeding the scope of allowable discovery to the extent it
13 includes entities and individuals not named as parties (some of whom may be
14 unknown to Responding Party) in the instant Action, and over whom Responding
15 Party exercises no control. In responding to these Interrogatories, Responding Party
16 shall interpret the terms “YOU” and “YOUR” to refer only to Responding Party
17 Sunny Khachatryan.

18 15. Responding Party objects to each interrogatory to the extent that they
19 seek confidential, proprietary business documents and information. Responding
20 Party notes that no protective order has yet been entered by the Court. Until such
21 time as a protective order is entered, Responding Party shall withhold production of
22 all documents so that they may be endorsed with the appropriate level of
23 confidentiality at the time of production.

24 16. Responding Party’s response to any specific interrogatory below is not
25 an admission that responsive, non-privileged information or documents exist in its
26 possession, custody, or control.

27 17. Each and all of these General Objections shall be deemed incorporated
28 by reference into each and every objection made herein to a specific interrogatory.

RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

State the full name, current residence address, date of birth, current telephone number, and Social Security number of the persons responding to these interrogatories.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad, particularly with respect to the terms “persons responding to these interrogatories.”

Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests information that is not relevant to any party’s claims or defenses and is not proportional to the needs of the case.

Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court. Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory because it seeks information that is neither relevant nor necessary to the claims and defenses in the instant Action.

Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine.

As phrased, Plaintiffs cannot discern what non-privileged information Defendant is specifically seeking in this Interrogatory that is relevant to any claim or defense, and proportional to the needs of the case at this stage in the action, and therefore cannot provide a further response unless and until Defendant provides a more particularized Interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2:

Identify all documents which concern, refer or relate to, or support the allegations of the Complaint.

1 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

2 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
3 particularly with respect to the terms “all documents” and “concern, refer or relate to,
4 or support.”

5 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
6 information that is not relevant to any party’s claims or defenses and is not
7 proportional to the needs of the case.

8 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
9 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court. Plaintiffs
10 further object to this Interrogatory because it seeks information that is neither relevant
11 nor necessary to the claims and defenses in the instant Action.

12 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
13 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine.

14 As phrased, Plaintiffs cannot discern what non-privileged information
15 Defendant is specifically seeking in this Interrogatory that is relevant to any claim or
16 defense, and proportional to the needs of the case at this stage in the action, and
17 therefore cannot provide a further response unless and until Defendant provides a
18 more particularized Interrogatory.

19

20 **INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

21 3. As to all damages Plaintiffs claim they has incurred:

22 a. state in detail the factual basis and amount, and

23 b. identify all documents which support Plaintiffs claims for
24 statutory damages, attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs of suit.

25 c. identify all documents which support Plaintiffs claims for actual
26 damages.

27

28

1 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

2 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
3 particularly with respect to the terms “persons responding to these interrogatories.”

4 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
5 information that is not relevant to any party’s claims or defenses and is not
6 proportional to the needs of the case.

7 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
8 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court. Plaintiffs
9 further object to this Interrogatory because it seeks highly confidential, commercially
10 sensitive and trade secret information that is neither relevant nor necessary to the
11 claims and defenses in the instant Action.

12 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
13 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine.

14 As phrased, Plaintiffs cannot discern what non-privileged information
15 Defendant is specifically seeking in this Interrogatory that is relevant to any claim or
16 defense, and proportional to the needs of the case at this stage in the action, and
17 therefore cannot provide a further response unless and until Defendant provides a
18 more particularized Interrogatory.

19

20 **INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

21 Identify all persons who may have any personal knowledge regarding the
22 allegations contained in the Complaint and state the substance of each person's
23 knowledge.

24 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

25 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
26 particularly with respect to the terms “all persons” and “any personal knowledge.”

27

28

1 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
2 information that is not relevant to any party's claims or defenses and is not
3 proportional to the needs of the case.

4 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
5 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court. Plaintiffs
6 further object to this Interrogatory because it seeks highly confidential, commercially
7 sensitive and trade secret information that is neither relevant nor necessary to the
8 claims and defenses in the instant Action.

9 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
10 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine.

11 As phrased, Plaintiffs cannot discern what non-privileged information
12 Defendant is specifically seeking in this Interrogatory that is relevant to any claim or
13 defense, and proportional to the needs of the case at this stage in the action, and
14 therefore cannot provide a further response unless and until Defendant provides a
15 more particularized Interrogatory.

16
17 **INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

18 Identify all persons who may have any personal knowledge regarding the
19 allegations contained in the Complaint and state the substance of each person's
20 knowledge.

21 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

22 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
23 particularly with respect to the terms "all persons" and "any personal knowledge."

24 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
25 information that is not relevant to any party's claims or defenses and is not
26 proportional to the needs of the case.

27 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
28 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court. Plaintiffs

1 further object to this Interrogatory because it seeks highly confidential, commercially
2 sensitive and trade secret information that is neither relevant nor necessary to the
3 claims and defenses in the instant Action.

4 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
5 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine.

6 Plaintiffs object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it is
7 duplicative of Request No. 4. Subject to the foregoing specific objections and the
8 General Objections, Plaintiffs refer to its Response to Request No. 4.

9
10 **INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

11 Has Plaintiff ever been a party to any lawsuit? If so, list the name, court number,
12 jurisdiction and outcome for all such lawsuits, including but not limited to all
13 bankruptcy filings that Plaintiff has filed within the last ten years, including the case
14 number and jurisdiction for each such filing and the dates each bankruptcy was closed.

15 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

16 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
17 particularly with respect to the terms “ever been” and “any lawsuit.”

18 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
19 information that is not relevant to any party’s claims or defenses and is not
20 proportional to the needs of the case.

21 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
22 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court. Plaintiffs
23 further object to this Interrogatory because it seeks information that is neither relevant
24 nor necessary to the claims and defenses in the instant Action.

25 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
26 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine.

27 As phrased, Plaintiffs cannot discern what non-privileged information
28 Defendant is specifically seeking in this Interrogatory that is relevant to any claim or

1 defense, and proportional to the needs of the case at this stage in the action, and
2 therefore cannot provide a further response unless and until Defendant provides a
3 more particularized Interrogatory.

4
5 **INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

6 Has Plaintiff ever been convicted of:

- 7 a. crime punishable by imprisonment in excess of 1 year, or
8 b. a crime involving dishonesty or false statement? If yes, please list the
9 case name, number, jurisdiction and outcome.
10 c. A bankruptcy or tax proceeding? If yes, please list the case name,
11 number, jurisdiction and outcome.

12 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

13 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
14 particularly with respect to the terms “ever been” and “any lawsuit.”

15 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
16 information that is not relevant to any party’s claims or defenses and is not
17 proportional to the needs of the case.

18 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
19 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court. Plaintiffs
20 further object to this Interrogatory because it seeks information that is neither relevant
21 nor necessary to the claims and defenses in the instant Action.

22 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
23 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine.

24 As phrased, Plaintiffs cannot discern what non-privileged information
25 Defendant is specifically seeking in this Interrogatory that is relevant to any claim or
26 defense, and proportional to the needs of the case at this stage in the action, and
27 therefore cannot provide a further response unless and until Defendant provides a
28 more particularized Interrogatory.

1 Plaintiffs object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it is
2 duplicative of Request No. 6. Subject to the foregoing specific objections and the
3 General Objections, Plaintiffs refer to its Response to Request No. 6.

4
5 **INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

6 Identify each and every person involved in posting the Photograph to Instagram
7 as alleged in Paragraph 19 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

8 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

9 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
10 particularly with respect to the terms “each and every” and “involved in posting.”

11 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
12 information that is not relevant to any party’s claims or defenses and is not
13 proportional to the needs of the case.

14 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
15 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court. Plaintiffs
16 further object to this Interrogatory because it seeks information that is neither relevant
17 nor necessary to the claims and defenses in the instant Action.

18 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
19 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine.

20 As phrased, Plaintiffs cannot discern what non-privileged information
21 Defendant is specifically seeking in this Interrogatory that is relevant to any claim or
22 defense, and proportional to the needs of the case at this stage in the action, and
23 therefore cannot provide a further response unless and until Defendant provides a
24 more particularized Interrogatory.

25
26 **INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

27 Describe all facts supporting the allegations in Paragraph 20 of Plaintiffs'
28 Complaint that the Photograph contained "copyright management information".

1 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

2 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
3 particularly with respect to the terms “all facts”.

4 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
5 information that is not relevant to any party’s claims or defenses and is not
6 proportional to the needs of the case.

7 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
8 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court. Plaintiffs
9 further object to this Interrogatory because it seeks information that is neither relevant
10 nor necessary to the claims and defenses in the instant Action.

11 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
12 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine.

13 Subject to the foregoing specific objections and the General Objections,
14 Plaintiffs respond that the Amended complaint does not have a claim for the removal
15 of copyright management information.

16

17 **INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

18 Describe all facts supporting the allegations in Paragraph 20 of Plaintiffs'
19 Complaint that the Photograph contained "copyright management information".

20 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

21 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
22 particularly with respect to the terms “all facts”.

23 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
24 information that is not relevant to any party’s claims or defenses and is not
25 proportional to the needs of the case.

26 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
27 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court. Plaintiffs

28

1 further object to this Interrogatory because it seeks information that is neither relevant
2 nor necessary to the claims and defenses in the instant Action.

3 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
4 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine.

5 Plaintiffs object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it is
6 duplicative of Request No. 9.

7 Subject to the foregoing specific objections and the General Objections,
8 Plaintiff refers to its Response to Request No. 9. Subject to the foregoing specific
9 objections and the General Objections, Plaintiffs respond that the Amended complaint
10 does not have a claim for the removal of copyright management information.

11
12 **INTERROGATORY NO. 11:**

13 Describe all facts supporting the allegations contained in Paragraph 5 of
14 Plaintiffs' Complaint regarding Minor Plaintiffs' appearance in "television
15 commercials, print ads, and other paid commercial uses of their images and likeness."
16 State with specificity each commercial, ad or other paid use of their image(s) from
17 January 1, 2020 through present day, and provide the relevant payment and terms for
18 each.

19 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 11:**

20 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
21 particularly with respect to the terms "all facts" and "each commercial, ad or other
22 paid use".

23 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
24 information that is not relevant to any party's claims or defenses and is not
25 proportional to the needs of the case.

26 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
27 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court.

1 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
2 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine.

3
4 **INTERROGATORY NO. 12:**

5 Describe all facts supporting the allegations contained in Paragraph 5 of
6 Plaintiffs' Complaint regarding Minor Plaintiffs' modeling contracts with Adidas.

7 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 12:**

8 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
9 particularly with respect to the terms "all facts" and "each commercial, ad or other
10 paid use".

11 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
12 information that is not relevant to any party's claims or defenses and is not
13 proportional to the needs of the case.

14 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
15 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court.

16 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
17 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine.

18
19 **INTERROGATORY NO. 13:**

20 Describe all facts supporting the allegations contained in Paragraph 17 of
21 Plaintiffs' Complaint regarding Minor Plaintiffs' multiple modeling contracts for
22 "several five-star hotel chains" and consideration for a "multi-million-dollar hotel
23 endorsement".

24 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 13:**

25 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
26 particularly with respect to the terms "all facts" and "consideration."

1 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
2 information that is not relevant to any party's claims or defenses and is not
3 proportional to the needs of the case.

4 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
5 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court. Plaintiffs
6 further object to this Interrogatory because it seeks information that is neither relevant
7 nor necessary to the claims and defenses in the instant Action.

8 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
9 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. As
10 phrased, Plaintiffs cannot discern what non-privileged information Defendant is
11 specifically seeking in this Interrogatory that is relevant to any claim or defense, and
12 proportional to the needs of the case at this stage in the action, and therefore cannot
13 provide a further response unless and until Defendant provides a more particularized
14 Interrogatory.

15
16 **INTERROGATORY NO. 14:**

17 State all social media accounts that You have had from January 1, 2020,
18 through the present (e.g. Facebook, Twitter (or X), Instagram, Snapchat, Google+,
19 etc.) and, for each, state when You first created the account.

20 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 14:**

21 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
22 particularly with respect to the terms "all social media accounts", "You", and "when
23 You first created the account."

24 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
25 information that is not relevant to any party's claims or defenses and is not
26 proportional to the needs of the case.

27 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
28 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court. Plaintiffs

1 further object to this Interrogatory because it seeks information that is neither relevant
2 nor necessary to the claims and defenses in the instant Action.

3 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
4 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. As
5 phrased, Plaintiffs cannot discern what non-privileged information Defendant is
6 specifically seeking in this Interrogatory that is relevant to any claim or defense, and
7 proportional to the needs of the case at this stage in the action, and therefore cannot
8 provide a further response unless and until Defendant provides a more particularized
9 Interrogatory.

10
11 **INTERROGATORY NO. 15:**

12 State all social media accounts that Minor Plaintiffs have had from January 1,
13 2020, through the present (e.g. Facebook, Twitter (or X), Instagram, Snapchat,
14 Google+, etc.) and, for each, state when and who first created the account.

15 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 15:**

16 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
17 particularly with respect to the terms “all social media accounts” and “when and who
18 first created the account.”

19 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
20 information that is not relevant to any party’s claims or defenses and is not
21 proportional to the needs of the case.

22 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
23 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court. Plaintiffs
24 further object to this Interrogatory because it seeks information that is neither relevant
25 nor necessary to the claims and defenses in the instant Action.

26 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
27 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine.

1 Plaintiffs also object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it is
2 duplicative of Request No. 14.

3 Subject to the foregoing specific objections and the General Objections,
4 Plaintiffs refer to its Response to Request No. 14.

5
6 **INTERROGATORY NO. 16:**

7 Describe each and every website or social media account that You own,
8 operate, or which is operated on Plaintiffs behalf.

9 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 16:**

10 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
11 particularly with respect to the terms “each and every” and “You own, operate, or
12 which is operated on Plaintiffs behalf.”

13 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
14 information that is not relevant to any party’s claims or defenses and is not
15 proportional to the needs of the case.

16 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
17 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court. Plaintiffs
18 further object to this Interrogatory because it seeks information that is neither relevant
19 nor necessary to the claims and defenses in the instant Action.

20 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
21 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. As
22 phrased, Plaintiffs cannot discern what non-privileged information Defendant is
23 specifically seeking in this Interrogatory that is relevant to any claim or defense, and
24 proportional to the needs of the case at this stage in the action, and therefore cannot
25 provide a further response unless and until Defendant provides a more particularized
26 Interrogatory.

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 17:**

2 Describe in detail how and when Plaintiffs first identified the Photograph on
3 Defendants' website.

4 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17:**

5 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
6 particularly with respect to the terms “how and when” and “first identified the
7 Photograph on Defendants’ website.”

8 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
9 information that is not relevant to any party’s claims or defenses and is not
10 proportional to the needs of the case.

11 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
12 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court. Plaintiffs
13 further object to this Interrogatory because it seeks information that is neither relevant
14 nor necessary to the claims and defenses in the instant Action.

15 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
16 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine.
17 As phrased, Plaintiffs cannot discern what non-privileged information Defendant is
18 specifically seeking in this Interrogatory that is relevant to any claim or defense, and
19 proportional to the needs of the case at this stage in the action, and therefore cannot
20 provide a further response unless and until Defendant provides a more particularized
21 Interrogatory.

22
23 **INTERROGATORY NO. 18:**

24 Describe in detail any and all profits, wages, or other compensation Minor
25 Plaintiffs have received from January 1, 2020, through present.

26 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 18:**

27 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
28

1 particularly with respect to the terms “any and all” and “profits, wages, or
2 compensation.”

3 Plaintiffs further object to this Interrogatory to the extent it requests
4 information that is not relevant to any party’s claims or defenses and is not
5 proportional to the needs of the case.

6 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks production of
7 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court. Plaintiffs
8 further object to this Interrogatory because it seeks information that is neither relevant
9 nor necessary to the claims and defenses in the instant Action.

10 Plaintiffs object to this Interrogatory to the extent that it calls for information
11 that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine.

12 As phrased, Plaintiffs cannot discern what non-privileged information
13 Defendant is specifically seeking in this Interrogatory that is relevant to any claim or
14 defense, and proportional to the needs of the case at this stage in the action, and
15 therefore cannot provide a further response unless and until Defendant provides a
16 more particularized Interrogatory.

1 DATED: July 12, 2024

TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP

2
3 By: /s/ Brian Bloom

4 Tyler R. Dowdall, State Bar No. 258950

tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com

5 Renata A. Guidry, State Bar No. 227713

rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com

6 **TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP**

7 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N

8 Los Angeles, California 90067

9 Telephone: (424) 330-8580

Facsimile: (315) 512-1465

10 Brian Bloom (*pro hac vice*)

bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com

11 Eliezer Lekht (*pro hac vice*)

elekht@tarterkrinsky.com

12 **TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP**

13 1350 Broadway

14 New York, New York 10018

15 Telephone: (212) 574-0350

16 Facsimile: (212) 216-8001

17 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs* Sunny Khachatryan,
18 Tatevik Khachatryan, B.A.J, a minor and I.M, a
19 minor
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

**SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, an individual, et al. v. 1 HOTEL WEST
HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and **not a party to this action**. I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. My business address is 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N, Los Angeles, CA 90067.

On July 15, 2024, I served true copies of the following document(s) described as **PLAINTIFF SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, AN INDIVIDUAL, RESPONSES TO DEFENDANTS 1 HOTEL WEST HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.; SH GROUP OPERATIONS, L.L.C.; SH GROUP GLOBAL IP HOLDINGS, L.L.C.'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO PLAINTIFF SUNNY KHACHATRYAN** on the interested parties in this action as follows:

CLARK HILL LLP	Attorneys for Defendants 1
Myriah Jaworski	HOTEL WESTHOLLYWOOD,
mjaworski@clarkhill.com	L.L.C.; SH GROUP
One America Plaza	OPERATIONS, L.L.C.;
600 West Broadway, Suite 500	SH GROUP GLOBAL IP
San Diego, CA 92101	HOLDINGS, L.L.C.
Telephone: (619) 557-0404	
Facsimile: (619) 557-0460	

BY E-MAIL OR ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION: I caused a copy of the document(s) to be sent from e-mail address BGenser@tarterkrinsky.com to the persons at the e-mail addresses listed in the Service List. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on July 15, 2024, at Los Angeles, California.

/s/ Brooke M. Genser

Brooke M. Genser

Exhibit 8

CLARK HILL LLP
Myriah Jaworski (SBN 336898)
mjaworski@clarkhill.com
One America Plaza
600 West Broadway, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 557-0404
Facsimile: (619) 557-0460

Attorneys for Defendants 1 HOTEL WEST
HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.; SH GROUP OPERATIONS,
L.L.C.; SH GROUP GLOBAL IP HOLDINGS, L.L.C.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, AN
INDIVIDUAL; TATEVIK
KHACHATRYAN, AN INDIVIDUAL;
BRAVE ANGELO JOHNSON, A
MINOR; AND ISABELLA MURRAY,
A MINOR,

Plaintiffs,

v.

1 HOTEL WEST HOLLYWOOD,
L.L.C.; SH GROUP OPERATIONS,
L.L.C.; SH GROUP GLOBAL IP
HOLDINGS, L.L.C.; AND DOES 1
THROUGH 70, INCLUSIVE,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-10829-ODW-E

**DEFENDANTS 1 HOTEL WEST
HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.; SH GROUP
OPERATIONS, L.L.C.; SH GROUP
GLOBAL IP HOLDINGS, L.L.C.'S
FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR
PRODUCTION TO PLAINTIFFS**

Pursuant to Rule 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendants
1Hotel West Hollywood, L.L.C.; SH Group Operations, L.L.C.; and SH Group
Global IP Holdings, L.L.C. (collectively, "Defendants"), through its counsel,
requires that Plaintiffs Sunny Khachatryan, Tatevik Khachatryan, B.A.J, and I.M.
provide full and complete answers, in writing and under oath, to the following
interrogatories within 30 days of the date of service hereof:

INSTRUCTIONS

A. All requests shall be answered as required by Rule 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure within thirty (30) days of service of these requests for production.

B. All documents are to be produced as they are kept in the usual course of business with any identifying labels, file markings, or similar identifying features, or shall be organized and labeled to correspond to the categories requested herein. If there are no documents in response to a particular request or if you withhold any responsive documents or categories of documents based on any objections, you shall state so in writing.

C. Electronically stored information (ESI) must be produced in its original native format with its accompanying metadata.

D. These requests call for the production of all responsive documents in your possession, custody, or control, or in the possession, custody, or control of your employees, predecessors, successors, parents, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, partners, joint venturers, brokers, accountants, financial advisors, representatives, and agents or other persons acting on your behalf, without regard to the physical location of such documents.

E. In responding to these requests, include documents obtained on your behalf by your counsel, employees, agents, or any other persons acting on your behalf. If your response is that the documents are not within your possession or custody, describe in detail the unsuccessful efforts you made to locate each such document. If your response is that documents are not under your control, identify who has the control and the location of the documents.

F. In responding to these requests and interrogatories, you are required to divulge all information and/or documents which are in the possession, custody, or control of You, Your attorneys, investigators, agents, employees, or other representatives, or their agents or persons or entities acting or purporting to act on

1 Your or their behalf. In responding, you must furnish all information available.

2 G. If you cannot answer any request set forth herein in full, after exercising
3 due diligence to secure the information, so state and answer to the fullest extent
4 possible, specifying the reasons for Your inability to answer the remainder and
5 stating whatever information or knowledge You have concerning the unanswered
6 portion.

7 H. If You object to any request or interrogatory set forth herein, state the
8 reasons for the objection with specificity.

9 I. If you object to any request or any portion of an request on the ground
10 that the answer reflects or would reveal the substance of a privileged
11 communication, identify:

12 (a) the nature of the privilege claimed;

13 (b) the person who made the communication, whether oral or in writing;

14 (c) if the communication was oral, all persons present while the
15 communication was made;

16 (d) if the communication was written, the author, addressees, and any other
17 recipients;

18 (e) the relationship of the author of the communication to each recipient;

19 (f) the relationship of the persons present to the person who made the
20 communication;

21 (g) the date and place of the communication; and

22 (h) the general subject matter of the communication.

23 J. Wherever the singular form of a noun is used, it is intended to and does
24 apply as well to the plural form of the noun. Whenever the plural form of a noun is
25 used, it is intended to and does apply as well to the singular form of the noun unless
26 otherwise specified.

27 K. For the convenience of the parties, each request should be quoted in full
28 immediately preceding the response.

1 L. These requests are continuing requests and require that You supplement
2 Your answers setting forth any and all information within the scope of each request
3 and interrogatory as may be acquired by You, Your agents, attorneys or
4 representatives following the service of Your original answers.

5 **DEFINITIONS**

6 1. “Defendants” means Defendants 1Hotel West Hollywood, L.L.C., SH
7 Group Operations, L.L.C., and SH Group Global IP Holdings, L.L.C., the
8 Defendants in the above-captioned proceeding.

9 2. “Plaintiff”, “you,” or “your” means Plaintiff Sunny Khachatryan.

10 3. “Plaintiffs” means Plaintiffs Sunny Khachatryan, Tatevik Khachatryan,
11 B.A.J., and I.M.

12 4. “Concerning” means consisting of, referring to, relating to, reflecting,
13 or being in any way logically or factually connected with the matter discussed.

14 5. “Communication” means the transmittal of information (in the form of
15 facts, ideas, inquiries, or otherwise).

16 6. “Date” means the exact day, month, and year if ascertainable, or, if not,
17 the best available approximation (including relationship to other events).

18 7. “Describe” means set forth fully and unambiguously every fact relevant
19 to the subject of the interrogatory, of which you (including your agents and
20 representatives) have knowledge or information.

21 8. “Document” is synonymous in meaning and equal in scope to its usage
22 in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34(a)(1)(A). The term “document” refers to any
23 document now or at any time in Plaintiff’s possession, custody, or control. A person
24 is deemed in control of a document if the person has any ownership, possession, or
25 custody of the document, or the right to secure the document or a copy thereof from
26 any person or public or private entity having physical possession thereof.

27 9. “Identify” with respect to a person who is an individual means to state
28 that person’s full name, present or last known address, and current or last known

1 place of employment.

2 10. “Identify” with respect to a person that is not an individual means to
3 state its: full name, legal form, date of organization, state of incorporation or
4 organization or other business or license authority, present or last known address and
5 telephone number, and the identity of its chief executive officer, partners, or persons
6 in equivalent positions.

7 11. “Identify” with respect to a document means to give, to the extent
8 known, the (a) type of document; (b) general subject matter; (c) date of the
9 document; and (d) author(s), addressee(s) and recipient(s). In the alternative, the
10 responding party may produce the documents, together with identifying information
11 sufficient to satisfy Rule 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

12 12. “Identify” with respect to communications means to give, to the extent
13 known, (a) a description of the substance of the communication; (b) the form of the
14 communication (e.g., telephone, facsimile, email, etc.); (c) the identity of each
15 person that was a party to and/or present at the time of the communication, as well
16 as the full name, present or last known address, and the current or last known place
17 of employment of each person; (d) the identity of the person whom you contend
18 initiated the communication; and (e) the time, date, and place of the communication.

19 13. “Minor Plaintiffs” means Plaintiffs B.A.J., a minor, and I.M, a minor.

20 14. “Photograph” means the photograph created on or about January 3,
21 2021, and at issue in the Complaint. *See* Compl. ¶16, *et. seq.*

22 15. The term “person” means any natural person or any legal entity,
23 including, but not limited to, any business or governmental entity, organization, or
24 association.

25 16. The terms “and” and “or” shall be construed either conjunctively or
26 disjunctively as necessary to bring within the scope of the interrogatory all responses
27 that might otherwise fall outside the scope of this interrogatory.

28 17. The term “identity” refers to any attribute of an individual to an

1 ordinary, reasonable viewer or listener, including but not limited to (i) name, (ii)
2 signature, (iii) photograph, (iv) (v) signature, (vi) photograph, (vii) image, (viii)
3 address, or (ix) family member identity information.

4 18. The terms “all,” “any,” or “each” encompass any and all of the matter
5 discussed.

6 19. The use of singular form includes plural, and vice versa.

7 20. The use of present tense includes past tense, and vice versa.

8 21. The masculine form shall also be construed to include the feminine and
9 vice versa.

10 **REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION**

11 1. Any and all documents that support or refute any of Plaintiffs answers
12 to Defendants’ interrogatories directed at You and/or Plaintiffs.

13 2. Any and all documents that relate to, support, or refute Plaintiffs’
14 claims for statutory damages, actual damages, attorneys’ fees, litigation expenses,
15 costs and any other damages Plaintiffs seek as a result of the allegations contained
16 in the Complaint.

17 3. Any and all documents reflecting Plaintiffs public facing social media
18 accounts (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.).

19 4. Any and all documents reflecting correspondence between Plaintiffs
20 and Plaintiffs’ counsel prior to signing an engagement agreement.

21 5. Any and all documents evidencing communications between you and
22 any third-party relating to the claims in this case.

23 6. Any and all documents evidencing actual or attempted monetization
24 related to the use or value of Minor Plaintiffs’ identity.

25 7. Any and all documents relating to a photo shoot, modeling job, acting
26 job, or brand influence promotion in which Minor Plaintiffs have performed since
27 January 1, 2020, through present, including any documents that evidence, reflect, or
28 otherwise refer to monetary payments for and the transfer or assignment of any

1 intellectual property rights relating to said shoot/job/promotion.

2 8. Any and all contracts or agreements that were ever entered into, and/or
3 was in effect, between Minor Plaintiffs and any talent agent or talent management
4 representative or since January 1, 2020, through present.

5 9. Any and all documents and/or communications related to the copyright
6 registration of the Photograph as alleged in Paragraphs 16 through 22 of Plaintiffs'
7 Complaint.

8 10. Any and all documents and/or communications related to the issue of
9 consent of use of the Photograph as alleged in Paragraph 30 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

10 11. Any and all documents and/or communications detailing any profits,
11 wages, or other compensation Minor Plaintiffs have received from January 1, 2020,
12 through present.

13 12. Any and all documents supporting or refuting any claim in this case.

14 13. Any and all documents supporting or refuting any claim for damages in
15 this case.

16
17 Dated: June 14, 2024

CLARK HILL LLP

18
19 By: /s/ Myriah V. Jaworski
20 Myriah V. Jaworski (SBN 336898)

21 Attorneys for Defendants 1 HOTEL
22 WEST HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.; SH
23 GROUP OPERATIONS, L.L.C.; SH
24 GROUP GLOBAL IP HOLDINGS,
25 L.L.C
26
27
28

Exhibit 9

1 TYLER R. DOWDALL, State Bar No. 258950
tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com

2 RENATA A. GUIDRY, State Bar No. 227713
rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com

3 **TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP**

2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N

4 Los Angeles, California 90067

Telephone: (424) 330-8580

5 Facsimile: (315) 512-1465

6 BRIAN BLOOM (*pro hac vice*)

bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com

7 ELIEZER LEKHT (*pro hac vice*)

elekht@tarterkrinsky.com

8 **TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP**

1350 Broadway

9 New York, New York 10018

Telephone: (212) 574-0350

10 Facsimile: (212) 216-8001

11 *Attorneys for* Plaintiffs Sunny
Khachatryan, Tatevik Khachatryan, B.A.J,
12 a minor and I.M, a minor

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
14 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

15
16 SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, an
individual; TATEVIK
17 KHACHATRYAN, an individual; B. A.
J, a minor; and I.M, a minor,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 vs.

20
21 1 HOTEL WEST HOLLYWOOD,
L.L.C.; SH GROUP OPERATIONS,
22 L.L.C.; SH GROUP GLOBAL IP
HOLDINGS, L.L.C; and DOES 1
23 through 70, inclusive,

24 Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-10829-ODW(Ex)

**PLAINTIFFS SUNNY
KHACHATRYAN, AN
INDIVIDUAL; TATEVIK
KHACHATRYAN, AN
INDIVIDUAL; B. A. J, A MINOR;
AND I.M, A MINOR'S RESPONSES
TO DEFENDANTS 1 HOTEL WEST
HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.; SH GROUP
OPERATIONS, L.L.C.; SH GROUP
GLOBAL IP HOLDINGS, L.L.C.'S
FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR
PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS**

1 PROPOUNDING PARTY: DEFENDANTS 1 HOTEL WEST HOLLYWOOD,
2 L.L.C.; SH GROUP OPERATIONS, L.L.C.; SH
3 GROUP GLOBAL IP HOLDINGS, L.L.C
4 RESPONDING PARTY: PLAINTIFFS SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, AN
5 INDIVIDUAL; TATEVIK KHACHATRYAN, AN
6 INDIVIDUAL; B. A. J, A MINOR; AND I.M, A
7 MINOR PLAINTIFFS SUNNY KHACHATRYAN,
8 AN INDIVIDUAL; TATEVIK KHACHATRYAN,
9 AN INDIVIDUAL; B. A. J, A MINOR; AND I.M, A
10 MINOR
11 SET NO.: ONE
12 REQUEST NOS.: 1–13

13 Pursuant to Rules 26 and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs
14 Sunny Khachatryan, Tatevik Khachatryan, B.A.J, a minor and I.M, a minor, by and
15 through their counsel, hereby submits these objections and responses to Defendants 1
16 HOTEL WEST HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.; SH GROUP OPERATIONS, L.L.C.; SH
17 GROUP GLOBAL IP HOLDINGS, L.L.C. “Defendants”) Requests for Production
18 of Documents as follows”

19 **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

20 Responding Party’s investigation, discovery and analysis are ongoing, and
21 Responding Party’s response to each of these Document Requests is based on
22 information and documents presently available to Responding Party after reasonable
23 inquiry. Responding Party reserves the right to supplement or amend these responses
24 in the event further information and/or documents are disclosed or discovered. In
25 addition, Responding Party’s responses are given without prejudice to its right to
26 introduce as evidence at trial any subsequently discovered or unintentionally omitted
27 information and/or documents.

28

1 Specific objections to each of these Document Requests are made on an
2 individual basis in the responses below. In addition to these specific objects,
3 Responding Party makes certain continuing objections (“General Objections”) to the
4 Document Requests. These General Objections are hereby incorporated by reference
5 into the responses made with respect to each separate document request. For
6 particular emphasis, Responding Party has, from time to time, expressly included one
7 or more of the General Objections in certain of its response below. Responding
8 Party’s response to each individual request is submitted without prejudice to, and
9 without in any respect waiving, any General Objections not expressly set forth in that
10 response. Accordingly, the inclusion of any specific objection in a response to a
11 document request below is neither intended as, nor shall in any way be deemed to
12 be, a waiver of any General Objections or of any specific objection made herein or
13 that may be asserted at a later date. In addition, the failure to include at this time any
14 continuing or specific objection to a document request is neither intended as, nor
15 shall in any way be deemed to be, a waiver of Responding Party’s right to assert that
16 or any other objection at a later date.

17 No incidental or implied admissions are intended by the responses herein.
18 Responding Party’s response and/or objections to a particular document request shall
19 not be taken as an admission that Responding Party accepts or admits the existence
20 of any “fact” set forth in or assumed by that document request.

21 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

22 Responding Party makes the following General Objections to Defendants’
23 Document Requests, including without limitation, the Instructions and Definitions
24 set forth therein, whether or not separately set forth in each response to each
25 individual document request:

26 1. Responding Party objects to the Document Requests to the extent they
27 seek information protected by any relevant privilege or legal protection, including,
28 without limitation, the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the joint

1 defense privilege, the settlement or settlement negotiation privilege, settlement
2 materials, or trial preparation materials. Any statement herein to the effect that
3 Responding Party will provide information in response to a document request is
4 limited to information that does not fall within the scope of any relevant privilege.

5 2. Responding Party objects to any requirement that it identify or provide
6 a list of any materials withheld from discovery pursuant to either the attorney-client
7 communications privilege and/or the attorney work product immunity and which
8 materials were created on or after December 27, 2023, the date on which this lawsuit
9 was filed. Such a requirement would be unduly burdensome and would interfere with
10 Responding Party's defense of this lawsuit by deterring the creation of such
11 documents.

12 3. Responding Party objects to the Document Requests to the extent they
13 seek information that is irrelevant to any claim or defense and not reasonably
14 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

15 4. Responding Party objects to the Document Requests on the grounds that
16 they are vague, ambiguous, and use unlimited, undefined, subjective or open-ended
17 terms or phrases.

18 5. Responding Party objects to the Document Requests to the extent that
19 the purported benefit of the discovery sought by the Document Requests is
20 outweighed by the burden and expense of responding to the Document Requests
21 pursuant to Rules 26(b)(1) and 26(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

22 6. Responding Party objects to the Document Requests to the extent they
23 purport to require complete responses from Responding Party within 30 days of
24 service. Responding Party's investigation of the claims and defenses at issue in this
25 Action is continuing, and Responding Party expressly reserves the right to
26 supplement these responses as necessary.

27 7. Responding Party objects to the Document Requests to the extent they
28 attempt to impose burdens on Responding Party inconsistent with, or in excess of,

1 the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Central District of
2 California Local Rules, or any applicable orders of this Court.

3 8. Responding Party objects to the Document Requests to the extent they
4 seek information unknown to Responding Party, that refers to persons, entities or
5 events not known to Responding Party, or that relates to documents not within
6 Responding Party's possession, custody, or control. Such a requirement would
7 exceed Responding Party's obligations under the Federal Rules and applicable Local
8 Rules and would subject Responding Party to unreasonable and undue oppression,
9 burden and expense. In responding to these Document Requests, Responding Party
10 shall respond only on behalf of itself and shall not undertake the burden and expense
11 of attempting to provide information presently unknown to Responding Party or
12 relating to documents outside Responding Party's possession, custody, or control.

13 9. Responding Party objects to the Document Requests to the extent that
14 they seek publicly-available information, or information that is equally available to
15 Plaintiff from sources other than Responding Party, on the grounds that such
16 Document Requests are unduly burdensome, oppressive, and harassing.

17 10. Responding Party objects to the Document Requests to the extent they
18 call for legal conclusions or contain express or implied assumptions of fact or law
19 with respect to matters at issue in this Action. Nothing in Responding Party's
20 responses or objections may be construed to reflect an agreement or concurrence by
21 Responding Party with Plaintiff's characterizations of any factual or legal issues.
22 Responding Party expressly reserves the right to contest any such characterization as
23 inaccurate and to provide and supplement its legal contentions in an appropriate
24 format on an appropriate schedule.

25 11. Responding Party objects to the Document Requests to the extent they
26 fail to specify a relevant time period, or to the extent any specified time period is
27 irrelevant to any claim or defense at issue in this Action, on the grounds that the
28 Document Requests are overly broad, unduly burdensome, and seek information that

1 is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
2 evidence.

3 12. Responding Party objects to the Document Requests to the extent they
4 fail to specify a relevant geographic area, or to the extent any specified geographic
5 area is irrelevant to any claim or defense at issue in this Action, on the grounds that
6 the Document Requests are overly broad, unduly burdensome, and seek information
7 that is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of
8 admissible evidence.

9 13. Responding Party objects to the Document Requests to the extent they
10 seek “all” documents or communications relating to a particular topic or category of
11 information on the grounds that the Document Requests are overly broad, unduly
12 burdensome, and seek information that is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated
13 to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

14 14. Responding Party objects to Plaintiff’s definition of the terms “YOU”
15 and “YOUR” as vague and ambiguous, especially to the extent it seeks discovery
16 regarding Responding Party’s “including its agents, attorneys, investigators,
17 affiliates and/or representatives, and any other person or entity who at any time has
18 acted or purported to act on behalf of Responding Party Sunny Khachatryan, and any
19 person answering these Requests.” Responding Party also objects to this definition
20 as overly broad and exceeding the scope of allowable discovery to the extent it
21 includes entities and individuals not named as parties (some of whom may be
22 unknown to Responding Party) in the instant Action, and over whom Responding
23 Party exercises no control. In responding to these Interrogatories, Responding Party
24 shall interpret the terms “YOU” and “YOUR” to refer only to Responding Party
25 Sunny Khachatryan.

26 15. Responding Party objects to the requests to the extent that they seek
27 confidential, proprietary business documents and information. Responding Party
28 notes that no protective order has yet been entered by the Court. Until such time as a

1 protective order is entered, Responding Party shall withhold production of all
2 documents so that they may be endorsed with the appropriate level of confidentiality
3 at the time of production.

4 16. Responding Party's response to any specific document request below is
5 not an admission that responsive, non-privileged information or documents exist in
6 its possession, custody, or control.

7 17. Each and all of these General Objections shall be deemed incorporated
8 by reference into each and every objection made herein to a specific document
9 request.

10 Without waiver of the foregoing, Responding Party further responds as
11 follows:

12 **RESPONSES TO DEMANDS FOR PRODUCTION**

13 **DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:**

14 Any and all documents that support or refute any of Plaintiffs answers to
15 Defendants' interrogatories directed at You and/or Plaintiffs.

16 **RESPONSE TO DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:**

17 Plaintiffs object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and
18 ambiguous, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the case, and seeks the
19 production of documents not related or relevant to the matter in controversy. The
20 Request is also indefinite as to time and is without reasonable limitation in its scope.
21 Specifically, Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
22 particularly with respect to the terms "Any and all documents" and "directed at You
23 and/Plaintiffs" responses."

24 Plaintiffs also object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it
25 requests information already known to Defendant.

26 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it seeks production of
27 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court.

28

1 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it calls for information that is
2 protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Plaintiffs also
3 object to this Request to the extent that it calls for a legal conclusion.

4 Subject to the foregoing specific objections and the General Objections,
5 Plaintiff will produce relevant, non-privileged documents in its possession, custody,
6 or control that can be located without undue burden, referenced in its responses to
7 Defendant's Request, after entry of a protective order by the Court.

8
9 **DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:**

10 Any and all documents that relate to, support, or refute Plaintiffs' claims for
11 statutory damages, actual damages, attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, costs and any
12 other damages Plaintiffs seek as a result of the allegations contained in the Complaint.

13 **RESPONSE TO DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:**

14 Plaintiffs object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and
15 ambiguous, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the case, and seeks the
16 production of documents not related or relevant to the matter in controversy. The
17 Request is also indefinite as to time and is without reasonable limitation in its scope.
18 Specifically, Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
19 particularly with respect to the terms "Any and all documents" and "relate to, support,
20 or refute."

21 Plaintiffs also object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it
22 requests information already known to Defendant.

23 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it seeks production of
24 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court.

25 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it calls for information that is
26 protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Plaintiffs also
27 object to this Request to the extent that it calls for a legal conclusion.

1 Subject to the foregoing specific objections and the General Objections,
2 Plaintiff will produce relevant, non-privileged documents in its possession, custody,
3 or control that can be located without undue burden, referenced in its responses to
4 Defendant's Request, after entry of a protective order by the Court.

5
6 **DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:**

7 Any and all documents reflecting Plaintiffs public facing social media accounts
8 (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.).

9 **RESPONSE TO DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:**

10 Plaintiffs object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and
11 ambiguous, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the case, and seeks the
12 production of documents not related or relevant to the matter in controversy. The
13 Request is also indefinite as to time and is without reasonable limitation in its scope.
14 Specifically, Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
15 particularly with respect to the terms "Any and all documents" and "reflecting
16 Plaintiffs public facing social media accounts."

17 Plaintiffs also object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it
18 requests information already known to Defendant.

19 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it seeks production of
20 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court.

21 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it calls for information that is
22 protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Plaintiffs also
23 object to this Request to the extent that it calls for a legal conclusion.

24 Subject to the foregoing specific objections and the General Objections,
25 Plaintiff will produce relevant, non-privileged documents in its possession, custody,
26 or control that can be located without undue burden, referenced in its responses to
27 Defendant's Request, after entry of a protective order by the Court.

1 **DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:**

2 Any and all documents reflecting correspondence between Plaintiffs and
3 Plaintiffs' counsel prior to signing an engagement agreement.

4 **RESPONSE TO DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:**

5 Plaintiffs object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and
6 ambiguous, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the case, and seeks the
7 production of documents not related or relevant to the matter in controversy. The
8 Request is also indefinite as to time and is without reasonable limitation in its scope.
9 Specifically, Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
10 particularly with respect to the terms "Any and all documents" and "correspondence
11 between Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' counsel prior to signing an engagement agreement."

12 Plaintiffs also object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it
13 requests information already known to Defendant.

14 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it seeks production of
15 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court.

16 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it calls for information that is
17 protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Plaintiffs also
18 object to this Request to the extent that it calls for a legal conclusion.

19 Plaintiff cannot discern what non-privileged information Defendant is
20 specifically seeking in this Request that is relevant to any claim or defense, and
21 proportional to the needs of the case at this stage in the action, and therefore cannot
22 provide a further response unless and until Defendant provides a more particularized
23 Request.

24

25 **DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:**

26 Any and all documents evidencing communications between you and any third-
27 party relating to the claims in this case.

28

1 **RESPONSE TO DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:**

2 Plaintiffs object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and
3 ambiguous, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the case, and seeks the
4 production of documents not related or relevant to the matter in controversy. The
5 Request is also indefinite as to time and is without reasonable limitation in its scope.
6 Specifically, Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
7 particularly with respect to the terms “Any and all documents”, “evidencing
8 communications”, and “between you and any third-party.”

9 Plaintiffs also object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it
10 requests information already known to Defendant.

11 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it seeks production of
12 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court.

13 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it calls for information that is
14 protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Plaintiffs also
15 object to this Request to the extent that it calls for a legal conclusion.

16 Plaintiff cannot discern what non-privileged information Defendant is
17 specifically seeking in this Request that is relevant to any claim or defense, and
18 proportional to the needs of the case at this stage in the action, and therefore cannot
19 provide a further response unless and until Defendant provides a more particularized
20 Request.

21
22 **DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:**

23 Any and all documents evidencing actual or attempted monetization related to
24 the use or value of Minor Plaintiffs' identity.

25 **RESPONSE TO DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:**

26 Plaintiffs object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and
27 ambiguous, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the case, and seeks the
28 production of documents not related or relevant to the matter in controversy. The

1 Request is also indefinite as to time and is without reasonable limitation in its scope.
2 Specifically, Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
3 particularly with respect to the terms “Any and all documents”, “evidencing actual or
4 attempted monetization”, and “the use or value of Minor Plaintiffs’ identit[ies].”

5 Plaintiffs also object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it
6 requests information already known to Defendant.

7 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it seeks production of
8 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court.

9 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it calls for information that is
10 protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Plaintiffs also
11 object to this Request to the extent that it calls for a legal conclusion.

12 Plaintiff cannot discern what non-privileged information Defendant is
13 specifically seeking in this Request that is relevant to any claim or defense, and
14 proportional to the needs of the case at this stage in the action, and therefore cannot
15 provide a further response unless and until Defendant provides a more particularized
16 Request.

17
18 **DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:**

19 Any and all documents relating to a photo shoot, modeling job, acting job, or
20 brand influence promotion in which Minor Plaintiffs have performed since January 1,
21 2020, through present, including any documents that evidence, reflect, or otherwise
22 refer to monetary payments for and the transfer or assignment of any intellectual
23 property rights relating to said shoot/job/promotion.

24 **RESPONSE TO DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:**

25 Plaintiffs object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and
26 ambiguous, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the case, and seeks the
27 production of documents not related or relevant to the matter in controversy.
28 Specifically, Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,

1 particularly with respect to the terms “Any and all documents” and “any documents
2 that evidence, reflect, or otherwise refer to monetary payments for and the transfer or
3 assignment of any intellectual property rights.”

4 Plaintiffs also object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it
5 requests information already known to Defendant.

6 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it seeks production of
7 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court.

8 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it calls for information that is
9 protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Plaintiffs also
10 object to this Request to the extent that it calls for a legal conclusion.

11 Subject to the foregoing specific objections and the General Objections,
12 Plaintiff will produce relevant, non-privileged documents in its possession, custody,
13 or control that can be located without undue burden, referenced in its responses to
14 Defendant’s Request, after entry of a protective order by the Court.

15
16 **DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:**

17 Any and all contracts or agreements that were ever entered into, and/or was in
18 effect, between Minor Plaintiffs and any talent agent or talent management
19 representative or since January 1, 2020, through present.

20 **RESPONSE TO DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:**

21 Plaintiffs object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and
22 ambiguous, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the case, and seeks the
23 production of documents not related or relevant to the matter in controversy.
24 Specifically, Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
25 particularly with respect to the terms “Any and all contracts or agreements” and “that
26 were ever entered into.”

27 Plaintiffs also object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it
28 requests information already known to Defendant.

1 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it seeks production of
2 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court.

3 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it calls for information that is
4 protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Plaintiffs also
5 object to this Request to the extent that it calls for a legal conclusion.

6 Subject to the foregoing specific objections and the General Objections,
7 Plaintiff will produce relevant, non-privileged documents in its possession, custody,
8 or control that can be located without undue burden, referenced in its responses to
9 Defendant's Request, after entry of a protective order by the Court.

10
11 **DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:**

12 Any and all documents and/or communications related to the copyright
13 registration of the Photograph as alleged in Paragraphs 16 through 22 of Plaintiffs'
14 Complaint.

15 **RESPONSE TO DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:**

16 Plaintiffs object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and
17 ambiguous, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the case, and seeks the
18 production of documents not related or relevant to the matter in controversy. The
19 Request is also indefinite as to time and is without reasonable limitation in its scope.
20 Specifically, Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
21 particularly with respect to the terms "Any and all documents" and "and/or
22 communications."

23 Plaintiffs also object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it
24 requests information already known to Defendant.

25 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it seeks production of
26 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court.

1 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it calls for information that is
2 protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Plaintiffs also
3 object to this Request to the extent that it calls for a legal conclusion.

4 Subject to the foregoing specific objections and the General Objections,
5 Plaintiff will produce relevant, non-privileged documents in its possession, custody,
6 or control that can be located without undue burden, referenced in its responses to
7 Defendant's Request, after entry of a protective order by the Court.

8
9 **DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:**

10 Any and all documents and/or communications related to the issue of consent
11 of use of the Photograph as alleged in Paragraph 30 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

12 **RESPONSE TO DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:**

13 Plaintiffs object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and
14 ambiguous, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the case, and seeks the
15 production of documents not related or relevant to the matter in controversy. The
16 Request is also indefinite as to time and is without reasonable limitation in its scope.
17 Specifically, Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
18 particularly with respect to the terms "Any and all documents" and "and/or
19 communications."

20 Plaintiffs also object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it
21 requests information already known to Defendant.

22 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it seeks production of
23 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court.

24 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it calls for information that is
25 protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Plaintiffs also
26 object to this Request to the extent that it calls for a legal conclusion.

27 Subject to the foregoing specific objections and the General Objections,
28 Plaintiff will produce relevant, non-privileged documents in its possession, custody,

1 or control that can be located without undue burden, referenced in its responses to
2 Defendant's Request, after entry of a protective order by the Court.

3
4 **DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:**

5 Any and all documents and/or communications detailing any profits, wages, or
6 other compensation Minor Plaintiffs have received from January 1, 2020, through
7 present.

8 **RESPONSE TO DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:**

9 Plaintiffs object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and
10 ambiguous, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the case, and seeks the
11 production of documents not related or relevant to the matter in controversy.
12 Specifically, Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
13 particularly with respect to the terms "Any and all documents" and "and/or
14 communications detailing any profits, wages, or other compensation."

15 Plaintiffs also object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it
16 requests information already known to Defendant.

17 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it seeks production of
18 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court.

19 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it calls for information that is
20 protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Plaintiffs also
21 object to this Request to the extent that it calls for a legal conclusion.

22 Subject to the foregoing specific objections and the General Objections,
23 Plaintiff will produce relevant, non-privileged documents in its possession, custody,
24 or control that can be located without undue burden, referenced in its responses to
25 Defendant's Request, after entry of a protective order by the Court.

26
27 **DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:**

28 Any and all documents supporting or refuting any claim in this case.

1 **RESPONSE TO DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:**

2 Plaintiffs object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and
3 ambiguous, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the case, and seeks the
4 production of documents not related or relevant to the matter in controversy. The
5 Request is also indefinite as to time and is without reasonable limitation in its scope.
6 Specifically, Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
7 particularly with respect to the terms “Any and all documents” and “any claim in this
8 case.”

9 Plaintiffs also object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it
10 requests information already known to Defendant.

11 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it seeks production of
12 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court.

13 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it calls for information that is
14 protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Plaintiffs also
15 object to this Request to the extent that it calls for a legal conclusion.

16 Plaintiff cannot discern what non-privileged information Defendant is
17 specifically seeking in this Request that is proportional to the needs of the case at this
18 stage in the action, and therefore cannot provide a further response unless and until
19 Defendant provides a more particularized Request.

20
21 **DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:**

22 Any and all documents supporting or refuting any claim for damages in this
23 case.

24 **RESPONSE TO DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:**

25 Plaintiffs object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and
26 ambiguous, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the case, and seeks the
27 production of documents not related or relevant to the matter in controversy. The
28 Request is also indefinite as to time and is without reasonable limitation in its scope.

1 Specifically, Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, indefinite, and overly broad,
2 particularly with respect to the terms “Any and all documents” and “supporting or
3 refuting any claim for damages in this case.”

4 Plaintiffs also object to this Request as unduly burdensome to the extent that it
5 requests information already known to Defendant.

6 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it seeks production of
7 confidential information prior to the entry of a protective order by the Court.

8 Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it calls for information that is
9 protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Plaintiffs also
10 object to this Request to the extent that it calls for a legal conclusion.

11 Plaintiff cannot discern what non-privileged information Defendant is
12 specifically seeking in this Request that is proportional to the needs of the case at this
13 stage in the action, and therefore cannot provide a further response unless and until
14 Defendant provides a more particularized Request.

1 DATED: July 12, 2024

TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP

2
3 By: /s/ Brian Bloom

4 Tyler R. Dowdall, State Bar No. 258950

tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com

5 Renata A. Guidry, State Bar No. 227713

rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com

6 **TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP**

7 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N

8 Los Angeles, California 90067

9 Telephone: (424) 330-8580

Facsimile: (315) 512-1465

10 Brian Bloom (*pro hac vice*)

11 bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com

12 Eliezer Lekht (*pro hac vice*)

elekht@tarterkrinsky.com

13 **TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP**

14 1350 Broadway

15 New York, New York 10018

16 Telephone: (212) 574-0350

Facsimile: (212) 216-8001

17 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs* Sunny Khachatryan,
18 Tatevik Khachatryan, B.A.J, a minor and I.M, a
19 minor
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

**SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, an individual, et al. v. 1 HOTEL WEST
HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and **not a party to this action**. I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. My business address is 2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N, Los Angeles, CA 90067.

On July 15, 2024, I served true copies of the following document(s) described as **PLAINTIFFS SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, AN INDIVIDUAL; TATEVIK KHACHATRYAN, AN INDIVIDUAL; B. A. J, A MINOR; AND I.M, A MINOR'S RESPONSES TO DEFENDANTS 1 HOTEL WEST HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.; SH GROUP OPERATIONS, L.L.C.; SH GROUP GLOBAL IP HOLDINGS, L.L.C.'S FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS** on the interested parties in this action as follows:

CLARK HILL LLP
Myriah Jaworski
mjaworski@clarkhill.com

One America Plaza
600 West Broadway, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 557-0404
Facsimile: (619) 557-0460

Attorneys for Defendants 1
HOTEL WESTHOLLYWOOD,
L.L.C.; SH GROUP
OPERATIONS, L.L.C.;
SH GROUP GLOBAL IP
HOLDINGS, L.L.C.

BY E-MAIL OR ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION: I caused a copy of the document(s) to be sent from e-mail address BGenser@tarterkrinsky.com to the persons at the e-mail addresses listed in the Service List. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on July 15, 2024, at Los Angeles, California.

/s/ Brooke M. Genser
Brooke M. Genser

Exhibit 10

CLARK HILL
Myriah V. Jaworski, Esq. (SBN 336898)
mjaworski@clarkhill.com
One America Plaza
600 West Broadway, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 557-0404
Facsimile: (619) 557-0460

Attorneys for Defendant 1 HOTEL WEST
HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, AN
INDIVIDUAL; TATEVIK
KHACHATRYAN, AN INDIVIDUAL;
B.A.J., A MINOR; AND I.M., A
MINOR,

Plaintiffs,

v.

1 HOTEL WEST HOLLYWOOD,
L.L.C.,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:23-cv-10829

**STIPULATED PROTECTIVE
ORDER**

Judge: Hon. Otis D. Wright II
Magistrate Judge: Hon. Charles F. Eick

I. PURPOSES AND LIMITATIONS

Discovery in this action is likely to involve production of confidential, proprietary or private information for which special protection from public disclosure and from use for any purpose other than pursuing this litigation may be warranted. Accordingly, the parties hereby stipulate to and petition the Court to enter the following Stipulated Protective Order. The parties acknowledge that this Order does not confer blanket protections on all disclosures or responses to discovery and that the protection it affords from public disclosure and use extends only to the limited information or items that are entitled to confidential treatment under the

1 applicable legal principles.

2 **II. GOOD CAUSE STATEMENT**

3 This action is likely to personal information related to minors and other
4 valuable commercial, financial, technical and/or proprietary information for which
5 special protection from public disclosure and from use for any purpose other than
6 prosecution of this action is warranted. Such confidential and proprietary materials
7 and information consist of, among other things, confidential business or financial
8 information, information regarding confidential business practices, or other
9 confidential commercial information (including information implicating privacy
10 rights of minors), information otherwise generally unavailable to the public, or
11 which may be privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure under state or
12 federal statutes, court rules, case decisions, or common law. Accordingly, to
13 expedite the flow of information, to facilitate the prompt resolution of disputes over
14 confidentiality of discovery materials, to adequately protect information the parties
15 are entitled to keep confidential, to ensure that the parties are permitted reasonable
16 necessary uses of such material in preparation for and in the conduct of trial, to
17 address their handling at the end of the litigation, and serve the ends of justice, a
18 protective order for such information is justified in this matter. It is the intent of the
19 parties that information will not be designated as confidential for tactical reasons
20 and that nothing be so designated without a good faith belief that it has been
21 maintained in a confidential, non-public manner, and there is good cause why it
22 should not be part of the public record of this case.

23 **III. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF UNDER SEAL FILING PROCEDURE**

24 The parties further acknowledge, as set forth in Section 14.3, below, that this
25 Stipulated Protective Order does not entitle them to file confidential information
26 under seal; Local Civil Rule 79-5 sets forth the procedures that must be followed
27 and the standards that will be applied when a party seeks permission from the court
28 to file material under seal. There is a strong presumption that the public has a right

1 of access to judicial proceedings and records in civil cases. In connection with non-
2 dispositive motions, good cause must be shown to support a filing under seal. *See*
3 *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2006),
4 *Phillips v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1210-11 (9th Cir. 2002), *Makar-*
5 *Welbon v. Sony Electronics, Inc.*, 187 F.R.D. 576, 577 (E.D. Wis. 1999) (even
6 stipulated protective orders require good cause showing), and a specific showing of
7 good cause or compelling reasons with proper evidentiary support and legal
8 justification, must be made with respect to Protected Material that a party seeks to
9 file under seal. The parties' mere designation of Disclosure or Discovery Material
10 as CONFIDENTIAL does not – without the submission of competent evidence by
11 declaration, establishing that the material sought to be filed under seal qualifies as
12 confidential, privileged, or otherwise protectable – constitute good cause.

13 Further, if a party requests sealing related to a dispositive motion or trial, then
14 compelling reasons, not only good cause, for the sealing must be shown, and the
15 relief sought shall be narrowly tailored to serve the specific interest to be protected.
16 *See Pintos v. Pacific Creditors Ass'n.*, 605 F.3d 665, 677-79 (9th Cir. 2010). For
17 each item or type of information, document, or thing sought to be filed or introduced
18 under seal, the party seeking protection must articulate compelling reasons,
19 supported by specific facts and legal justification, for the requested sealing order.
20 Again, competent evidence supporting the application to file documents under seal
21 must be provided by declaration.

22 Any document that is not confidential, privileged, or otherwise protectable in
23 its entirety will not be filed under seal if the confidential portions can be redacted. If
24 documents can be redacted, then a redacted version for public viewing, omitting only
25 the confidential, privileged, or otherwise protectable portions of the document, shall
26 be filed. Any application that seeks to file documents under seal in their entirety
27 should include an explanation of why redaction is not feasible.

28

1 **IV. DEFINITIONS**

2 4.1 Action: this pending lawsuit captioned *Sunny Khachatryan, et. al. v. 1*
3 *Hotel West Hollywood, LLC*, Case No. 2:23-cv-10829-ODW (C.D. Cal.).

4 4.2 Challenging Party: a Party or Non-Party that challenges the designation
5 of information or items under this Order.

6 4.3 “CONFIDENTIAL” Information or Items: information (regardless of
7 how it is generated, stored or maintained) or tangible things that qualify for
8 protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c), and as specified above in
9 the Good Cause Statement.

10 4.4 Counsel: Outside Counsel of Record and House Counsel (as well as
11 their support staff).

12 4.5 Designating Party: a Party or Non-Party that designates information or
13 items that it produces in disclosures or in responses to discovery as
14 “CONFIDENTIAL.”

15 4.6 Disclosure or Discovery Material: all items or information, regardless
16 of the medium or manner in which it is generated, stored, or maintained (including,
17 among other things, testimony, transcripts, and tangible Things), that are produced
18 or generated in disclosures or responses to discovery.

19 4.7 Expert: a person with specialized knowledge or experience in a matter
20 pertinent to the litigation who has been retained by a Party or its counsel to serve as
21 an expert witness or as a consultant in this Action.

22 4.8 House Counsel: attorneys who are employees of a party to this Action.
23 House Counsel does not include Outside Counsel of Record or any other outside
24 counsel.

25 4.9 Non-Party: any natural person, partnership, corporation, association or
26 other legal entity not named as a Party to this action.

27 4.10 Outside Counsel of Record: attorneys who are not employees of a party
28 to this Action but are retained to represent a party to this Action and have appeared

1 in this Action on behalf of that party or are affiliated with a law firm that has
2 appeared on behalf of that party, and includes support staff.

3 4.11 Party: any party to this Action, including all of its officers, directors,
4 employees, consultants, retained experts, and Outside Counsel of Record (and their
5 support staffs).

6 4.12 Producing Party: a Party or Non-Party that produces Disclosures or
7 Discovery Material in this Action.

8 4.13 Professional Vendors: persons or entities that provide litigation support
9 services (e.g., photocopying, videotaping, translating, preparing exhibits or
10 demonstrations, and organizing, storing, or retrieving data in any form or medium)
11 and their employees and subcontractors.

12 4.14 Protected Material: any Disclosure or Discovery Material that is
13 designated as “CONFIDENTIAL.”

14 4.15 Receiving Party: a Party that receives Disclosure or Discovery Material
15 from a Producing Party.

16 **V. SCOPE**

17 The protections conferred by this Stipulation and Order cover not only
18 Protected Material (as defined above), but also (1) any information copied or
19 extracted from Protected Material; (2) all copies, excerpts, summaries, or
20 compilations of Protected Material; and (3) any testimony, conversations, or
21 presentations by Parties or their Counsel that might reveal Protected Material. Any
22 use of Protected Material at trial shall be governed by the orders of the trial judge
23 and other applicable authorities. This Order does not govern the use of Protected
24 Material at trial.

25 **VI. DURATION**

26 Once a case proceeds to trial, information that was designated as
27 CONFIDENTIAL or maintained pursuant to this protective order used or introduced
28 as an exhibit at trial becomes public and will be presumptively available to all

1 members of the public, including the press, unless compelling reasons supported by
2 specific factual findings to proceed otherwise are made to the trial judge in advance
3 of the trial. *See Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1180-81 (distinguishing “good cause”
4 showing for sealing documents produced in discovery from “compelling reasons”
5 standard when merits-related documents are part of court record). Accordingly, the
6 terms of this protective order do not extend beyond the commencement of the trial.

7 **VII. DESIGNATING PROTECTED MATERIAL**

8 **7.1 Exercise of Restraint and Care in Designating Material for Protection.**

9 Each Party or Non-Party that designates information or items for protection under
10 this Order must take care to limit any such designation to specific material that
11 qualifies under the appropriate standards. The Designating Party must designate for
12 protection only those parts of material documents, items, or oral or written
13 communications that qualify so that other portions of the material, documents, items
14 or communications for which protection is not warranted are not swept unjustifiably
15 within the ambit of this Order.

16 Mass, indiscriminate or routinized designations are prohibited. Designations
17 that are shown to be clearly unjustified or that have been made for an improper
18 purpose (e.g., to unnecessarily encumber the case development process or to impose
19 unnecessary expenses and burdens on other parties) may expose the Designating
20 Party to sanctions.

21 If it comes to a Designating Party’s attention that information or items that it
22 designated for protection do not qualify for protection, that Designating Party must
23 promptly notify all other Parties that it is withdrawing the inapplicable designation.

24 **7.2 Manner and Timing of Designations.** Except as otherwise provided in
25 this Order, or as otherwise stipulated or ordered, Disclosure of Discovery Material
26 that qualifies for protection under this Order must be clearly so designated before
27 the material is disclosed or produced.

28 Designation in conformity with this Order requires:

1 (a) for information in documentary form (e.g., paper or electronic documents,
2 but excluding transcripts of depositions or other pretrial or trial proceedings), that
3 the Producing Party affix at a minimum, the legend “CONFIDENTIAL” (hereinafter
4 “CONFIDENTIAL legend”), to each page that contains protected material. If only
5 a portion of the material on a page qualifies for protection, the Producing Party also
6 must clearly identify the protected portion(s) (e.g., by making appropriate markings
7 in the margins). A Party or Non-Party that makes original documents available for
8 inspection need not designate them for protection until after the inspecting Party has
9 indicated which documents it would like copied and produced. During the inspection
10 and before the designation, all of the material made available for inspection shall be
11 deemed “CONFIDENTIAL.” After the inspecting Party has identified the
12 documents it wants copied and produced, the Producing Party must determine which
13 documents, or portions thereof, qualify for protection under this Order. Then, before
14 producing the specified documents, the Producing Party must affix the
15 “CONFIDENTIAL” legend to each page that contains Protected Material. If only a
16 portion of the material on a page qualifies for protection, the Producing Party also
17 must clearly identify the protected portion(s) (e.g., by making appropriate markings
18 in the margins).

19 (b) for testimony given in depositions that the Designating Party identifies the
20 Disclosure or Discovery Material on the record, before the close of the deposition
21 all protected testimony.

22 (c) for information produced in some form other than documentary and for
23 any other tangible items, that the Producing Party affix in a prominent place on the
24 exterior of the container or containers in which the information is stored the legend
25 “CONFIDENTIAL.” If only a portion or portions of the information warrants
26 protection, the Producing Party, to the extent practicable, shall identify the protected
27 portion(s).

28

1 7.3 Inadvertent Failures to Designate. If timely corrected, an inadvertent
2 failure to designate qualified information or items does not, standing alone, waive
3 the Designating Party's right to secure protection under this Order for such material.
4 Upon timely correction of a designation, the Receiving Party must make reasonable
5 efforts to assure that the material is treated in accordance with the provisions of this
6 Order.

7 **VIII. CHALLENGING CONFIDENTIALITY DESIGNATIONS**

8 8.1. Timing of Challenges. Any Party or Non-Party may challenge a
9 designation of confidentiality at any time that is consistent with the Court's
10 Scheduling Order.

11 8.2 Meet and Confer. The Challenging Party shall initiate the dispute
12 resolution process under Local Rule 37-1 *et. seq.*

13 8.3 Joint Stipulation. Any challenge submitted to the Court shall be via a
14 joint stipulation pursuant to Local Rule 37-2.

15 8.4 The burden of persuasion in any such challenge proceeding shall be on
16 the Designating Party. Frivolous challenges, and those made for an improper
17 purpose (e.g., to harass or impose unnecessary expenses and burdens on other
18 parties) may expose the Challenging Party to sanctions. Unless the Designating Party
19 has waived or withdrawn the confidentiality designation, all parties shall continue to
20 afford the material in question the level of protection to which it is entitled under the
21 Producing Party's designation until the Court rules on the challenge.

22 **IX. ACCESS TO AND USE OF PROTECTED MATERIAL**

23 9.1 Basic Principles. A Receiving Party may use Protected Material that is
24 disclosed or produced by another Party or by a Non-Party in connection with this
25 Action only for prosecuting, defending or attempting to settle this Action. Such
26 Protected Material may be disclosed only to the categories of persons and under the
27 conditions described in this Order. When the Action has been terminated, a
28

1 Receiving Party must comply with the provisions of section 15 below (FINAL
2 DISPOSITION).

3 Protected Material must be stored and maintained by a Receiving Party at a
4 location and in a secure manner that ensures that access is limited to the persons
5 authorized under this Order.

6 9.2 Disclosure of “CONFIDENTIAL” Information or Items. Unless
7 otherwise ordered by the court or permitted in writing by the Designating Party, a
8 Receiving Party may disclose any information or item designated
9 “CONFIDENTIAL” only to:

10 (a) the Receiving Party’s Outside Counsel of Record in this Action, as well as
11 employees of said Outside Counsel of Record to whom it is reasonably necessary to
12 disclose the information for this Action;

13 (b) the officers, directors, and employees (including House Counsel) of the
14 Receiving Party to whom disclosure is reasonably necessary for this Action;

15 (c) Experts (as defined in this Order) of the Receiving Party to whom
16 disclosure is reasonably necessary for this Action and who have signed the
17 “Acknowledgment and Agreement to Be Bound” (Exhibit A) [TO BE
18 NEGOTIATED AND PREPARED BY PARTIES AND ATTACHED TO
19 STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER];

20 (d) the court and its personnel;

21 (e) court reporters and their staff;

22 (f) professional jury or trial consultants, mock jurors, and Professional
23 Vendors to whom disclosure is reasonably necessary for this Action and who have
24 signed the “Acknowledgment and Agreement to Be Bound” (Exhibit A);

25 (g) the author or recipient of a document containing the information or a
26 custodian or other person who otherwise possessed or knew the information;

27 (h) during their depositions, witnesses, and attorneys for witnesses, in the
28 Action to whom disclosure is reasonably necessary provided: (1) the deposing party

1 requests that the witness sign the form attached as Exhibit A hereto; and (2) they
2 will not be permitted to keep any confidential information unless they sign the
3 “Acknowledgment and Agreement to Be Bound” (Exhibit A), unless otherwise
4 agreed by the Designating Party or ordered by the court. Pages of transcribed
5 deposition testimony or exhibits to depositions that reveal Protected Material may
6 be separately bound by the court reporter and may not be disclosed to anyone except
7 as permitted under this Stipulated Protective Order; and

8 (i) any mediators or settlement officers and their supporting personnel,
9 mutually agreed upon by any of the parties engaged in settlement discussions.

10 **X. PROTECTED MATERIAL SUBPOENAED OR ORDERED**
11 **PRODUCED IN OTHER LITIGATION**

12 If a Party is served with a subpoena or a court order issued in other litigation
13 that compels disclosure of any information or items designated in this Action as
14 “CONFIDENTIAL,” that Party must:

15 (a) promptly notify in writing the Designating Party. Such notification shall
16 include a copy of the subpoena or court order;

17 (b) promptly notify in writing the party who caused the subpoena or order to
18 issue in the other litigation that some or all of the material covered by the subpoena
19 or order is subject to this Protective Order. Such notification shall include a copy of
20 this Stipulated Protective Order; and

21 (c) cooperate with respect to all reasonable procedures sought to be pursued
22 by the Designating Party whose Protected Material may be affected. If the
23 Designating Party timely seeks a protective order, the Party served with the
24 subpoena or court order shall not produce any information designated in this action
25 as “CONFIDENTIAL” before a determination by the court from which the subpoena
26 or order issued, unless the Party has obtained the Designating Party’s permission.
27 The Designating Party shall bear the burden and expense of seeking protection in
28 that court of its confidential material and nothing in these provisions should be

1 construed as authorizing or encouraging a Receiving Party in this Action to disobey
2 a lawful directive from another court.

3 **XI. A NON-PARTY'S PROTECTED MATERIAL SOUGHT TO BE**
4 **PRODUCED IN THIS LITIGATION**

5 The terms of this Order are applicable to information produced by a Non-Party
6 in this Action and designated as "CONFIDENTIAL." Such information produced
7 by Non-Parties in connection with this litigation is protected by the remedies and
8 relief provided by this Order. Nothing in these provisions should be construed as
9 prohibiting a Non-Party from seeking additional protections.

10 In the event that a Party is required, by a valid discovery request, to produce
11 a Non-Party's confidential information in its possession, and the Party is subject to
12 an agreement with the Non-Party not to produce the Non-Party's confidential
13 information, then the Party shall:

14 (a) promptly notify in writing the Requesting Party and the NonParty that
15 some or all of the information requested is subject to a confidentiality agreement
16 with a Non-Party;

17 (b) promptly provide the Non-Party with a copy of the Stipulated Protective
18 Order in this Action, the relevant discovery request(s), and a reasonably specific
19 description of the information requested; and

20 (c) make the information requested available for inspection by the Non-Party,
21 if requested.

22 If the Non-Party fails to seek a protective order from this court within 14 days
23 of receiving the notice and accompanying information, the Receiving Party may
24 produce the Non-Party's confidential information responsive to the discovery
25 request. If the Non-Party timely seeks a protective order, the Receiving Party shall
26 not produce any information in its possession or control that is subject to the
27 confidentiality agreement with the Non-Party before a determination by the court.
28

Absent a court order to the contrary, the Non-Party shall bear the burden and expense of seeking protection in this court of its Protected Material.

XII. UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OF PROTECTED MATERIAL

If a Receiving Party learns that, by inadvertence or otherwise, it has disclosed Protected Material to any person or in any circumstance not authorized under this Stipulated Protective Order, the Receiving Party must immediately (a) notify in writing the Designating Party of the unauthorized disclosures, (b) use its best efforts to retrieve all unauthorized copies of the Protected Material, (c) inform the person or persons to whom unauthorized disclosures were made of all the terms of this Order, and (d) request such person or persons to execute the “Acknowledgment and Agreement to Be Bound” attached hereto as Exhibit A.

XIII. INADVERTENT PRODUCTION OF PRIVILEGED OR OTHERWISE PROTECTED MATERIAL

When a Producing Party gives notice to Receiving Parties that certain inadvertently produced material is subject to a claim of privilege or other protection, the obligations of the Receiving Parties are those set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(5)(B). This provision is not intended to modify whatever procedure may be established in an e-discovery order that provides for production without prior privilege review. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 502(d) and (e), insofar as the parties reach an agreement on the effect of disclosure of a communication or information covered by the attorney-client privilege or work product protection, the parties may incorporate their agreement in the stipulated protective order submitted to the court.

XIV. MISCELLANEOUS

14.1 Right to Further Relief. Nothing in this Order abridges the right of any person to seek its modification by the Court in the future.

14.2 Right to Assert Other Objections. By stipulating to the entry of this Protective Order, no Party waives any right it otherwise would have to object to

1 disclosing or producing any information or item on any ground not addressed in this
2 Stipulated Protective Order. Similarly, no Party waives any right to object on any
3 ground to use in evidence of any of the material covered by this Protective Order.

4 14.3 Filing Protected Material. A Party that seeks to file under seal any
5 Protected Material must comply with Local Civil Rule 79-5. Protected Material may
6 only be filed under seal pursuant to a court order authorizing the sealing of the
7 specific Protected Material. If a Party's request to file Protected Material under seal
8 is denied by the court, then the Receiving Party may file the information in the public
9 record unless otherwise instructed by the court.

10 **XV. FINAL DISPOSITION**

11 After the final disposition of this Action, as defined in paragraph 6, within 60
12 days of a written request by the Designating Party, each Receiving Party must return
13 all Protected Material to the Producing Party or destroy such material. As used in
14 this subdivision, "all Protected Material" includes all copies, abstracts, compilations,
15 summaries, and any other format reproducing or capturing any of the Protected
16 Material. Whether the Protected Material is returned or destroyed, the Receiving
17 Party must submit a written certification to the Producing Party (and, if not the same
18 person or entity, to the Designating Party) by the 60-day deadline that (1) identifies
19 (by category, where appropriate) all the Protected Material that was returned or
20 destroyed and (2) affirms that the Receiving Party has not retained any copies,
21 abstracts, compilations, summaries or any other format reproducing or capturing any
22 of the Protected Material. Notwithstanding this provision, Counsel are entitled to
23 retain an archival copy of all pleadings, motion papers, trial, deposition, and hearing
24 transcripts, legal memoranda, correspondence, deposition and trial exhibits, expert
25 reports, attorney work product, and consultant and expert work product, even if such
26 materials contain Protected Material. Any such archival copies that contain or
27 constitute Protected Material remain subject to this Protective Order as set forth in
28 Section 6 (DURATION).

1 **XVI. VIOLATION**

2 Any violation of this Order may be punished by appropriate measures
3 including, without limitation, contempt proceedings and/or monetary sanctions.
4

5 IT IS SO STIPULATED, THROUGH COUNSEL OF RECORD.
6

7
8 DATED: _____

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

9
10
11 DATED: _____

Attorneys for Defendant

12
13
14
15
16 FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN, IT IS SO ORDERED.
17

18 DATED: _____
19

20 _____
21 OTIS D. WIRIGHT, II
22 United States Magistrate Judge
23
24
25
26
27
28

Exhibit 11

CLARK HILL PLC
Myriah Jaworski (SBN 336898)
mjaworski@clarkhill.com
One America Plaza
600 West Broadway, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 557-0404
Facsimile: (619) 557-0460

Attorneys for Defendants 1 HOTEL WEST
HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.; SH GROUP OPERATIONS,
L.L.C.; SH GROUP GLOBAL IP HOLDINGS, L.L.C.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SUNNY KHACHATRYAN, AN
INDIVIDUAL; TATEVIK
KHACHATRYAN, AN INDIVIDUAL;
B.A.J., A MINOR; AND I.M., A
MINOR,

Plaintiffs,

v.

1 HOTEL WEST HOLLYWOOD,
L.L.C.; SH GROUP OPERATIONS,
L.L.C.; SH GROUP GLOBAL IP
HOLDINGS, L.L.C.; AND DOES 1
THROUGH 70, INCLUSIVE,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-10829-ODW-E

**DEFENDANTS 1 HOTEL WEST
HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.; SH GROUP
OPERATIONS, L.L.C.; SH GROUP
GLOBAL IP HOLDINGS, L.L.C.'S
NOTICE OF DEPOSITION OF
PLAINTIFF SUNNY
KHACHATRYAN**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that that on **August 7, 2024**, or as agreed upon by
the parties, Defendants will take the deposition upon oral examination of **Plaintiff
Sunny Khachatryan** pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b), at the law offices of Clark
Hill PLC, 555 South Flower Street, 24th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90071. The
deposition will be recorded by stenographic means and/or video recording before an
officer authorized to administer oaths. If necessary, the deposition will be adjourned
until completed.

1
2 Dated: July 9, 2024

CLARK HILL LLP

3
4 By: /s/ Myriah V. Jaworski
5 Myriah V. Jaworski (SBN 336898)

6 Attorneys for Defendants 1 HOTEL
7 WEST HOLLYWOOD, L.L.C.; SH
8 GROUP OPERATIONS, L.L.C.; SH
9 GROUP GLOBAL IP HOLDINGS,
10 L.L.C.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Exhibit 12



Nicolas V. Dolce
D (312) 360-2113
Email: ndolce@clarkhill.com

Clark Hill
130 E. Randolph Street, Suite 3900
Chicago, Illinois 60601
T (312) 985-5900
F (312) 985-5999

July 16, 2024

VIA EMAIL ONLY

Tyler R. Dowdall, tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com
Renata A. Guidry, rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com
Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP
2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N
Los Angeles, California 90067

Brian Bloom, bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com
Eliezer Lekht, elekht@tarterkrinsky.com
Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP
1350 Broadway
New York, New York 10018

Re: Written Discovery Deficiency Correspondence L.R. 37-1 Correspondence
Sunny Khachatryan, et. al. v. 1 Hotel West Hollywood, LLC
Case No. 2:23-cv-10829-ODW (C.D. Cal.)

Dear Counsel:

We write pursuant to Local Civil Rule 37-1 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 37, to request Plaintiffs supplementation of the deficiencies in their July 15, 2024 responses to Defendant 1 Hotel West Hollywood, LLC's ("1 Hotel") Interrogatories ("Interrog.") and Requests for Production ("RFP") (collectively "Discovery Requests").

Pursuant to Local Rule 37-1, please either confirm that you will provide supplemental responses curing your complete failure to respond to discovery by July 24, 2024, or provide your availability for a telephonic conference on either July 18, 2024 or July 19, 2024. As this involves Plaintiffs' complete refusal to answer Defendant's Discovery Requests (rather than a dispute as to sufficiency of responses), Defendant will promptly move for Plaintiffs' compliance if Plaintiffs do not either promptly confer or provide responses to Defendant's Discovery Requests.

* * *

Sunny Khachatryan, et. al. v. 1 Hotel West Hollywood, LLC
Case No. 2:23-cv-10829-ODW (C.D. Cal.) – L.R. 37-1 Correspondence
July 16, 2024
Page 2

I. Plaintiffs' Discovery Deficiencies

a. Plaintiffs Complete Refusal to Respond to Defendants' Discovery Requests

Plaintiffs objected to and ***refused to respond to all*** of 1 Hotel's Discovery Requests. In doing so, Plaintiffs relied on redundant boilerplate objections that provide no particularity for the basis of the objection. Most troublesome is that many of Plaintiffs' objections are the most dubious of straw men – Plaintiffs improperly transcribed Defendants' Discovery Requests in its responses and then asserted objections based on its own improper transcription.

"[A]ttempt[s] to evade disclosure through reliance on boilerplate objections is an abuse of the discovery process." *Marti v. Baires*, 1:08-CV-00653-AWI, 2012 WL 2029720, at *7 (E.D. Cal. June 5, 2012). Defendant's Discovery Requests are will within Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1) which allows "discovery regarding any nonprivileged matter that is relevant to any party's claim or defense." See *Insight Psychology & Addiction, Inc. v. City of Costa Mesa*, 2021 WL 6102425, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2021) ("[r]elevance under Rule 26(b)(1) is defined broadly").

Even if Plaintiffs could assert legitimate objections Defendant's discovery requests "[g]eneral or boilerplate objections . . . are improper." *A. Farber & Partners, Inc. v. Garber*, 234 F.R.D. 186, 188 (C.D. Cal. 2006). Relevancy objections require an "explanation or argument why the requested documents are not relevant." *Id.* "[B]urdensome and harassing" typically require "evidentiary declarations supporting such objection." *Id.* (citing *Paulsen v. Case Corp.*, 168 F.R.D. 285, 289 (C.D. Cal.1996)).

"Courts need not tolerate flagrant abuses of the discovery process." *Campbell Indus. v. M/V Gemini*, 619 F.2d 24, 27 (9th Cir. 1980). Plaintiffs' complete refusal to respond to a single discovery request, combined with its use of boilerplate objections, demonstrates an abject failure to participate in discovery in good faith. While Plaintiffs complete failure to participate in discovery warrants immediate court intervention, Defendant nonetheless submits this correspondence in compliance with L. Civ. R. 37. Please provide complete and proper responses to all discovery requests immediately.

b. Improper Blanket Confidentiality Objection

Plaintiffs' objection to every Discovery Request is not in good faith. Much of the expected information requested by Defendant would not be subject to confidentiality. For example, information like social media account names, identities of persons with factual knowledge of the allegations, and documents supporting damages calculations are not confidential information.

Highlighting Plaintiffs' lack of good faith is their failure to negotiate a protective order with Defendant, despite the expected reliance on confidentiality objections. It is curious that Plaintiffs have delayed prosecution of their own claims through their reluctance to produce information supporting their own claims. Nonetheless, Defendants have prepared a draft protective order using the Central District's model order.

Please promptly (1) supplement your responses with all non-confidential information, and (2) provide proposed revisions or consent to entry of the protective order.

Sunny Khachatryan, et. al. v. 1 Hotel West Hollywood, LLC
Case No. 2:23-cv-10829-ODW (C.D. Cal.) – L.R. 37-1 Correspondence
July 16, 2024
Page 3

c. Specific Requests for Supplementation

Pursuant to L. Civ. R. 37.1, Defendant's articulate the following deficiencies in Plaintiffs' Responses to Defendant's Discovery Requests:

- **Interrog. No. 1.** This request seeks basic information regarding the identity of the persons responsible for responding to these requests. Plaintiffs did not provide any particularized objection to this request. Please provide a full response.
- **Interrog. No. 2; RFP Nos. 1, 12.** These requests seek identification of any documents that support the allegations of the Amended Complaint. These documents are directly related to the issues of the case, specifically damages sought by Plaintiffs. Please produce the requested information.
- **Interrog. No. 3; RFP Nos. 3, 13.** These requests seek articulation of all damages incurred by Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint seeks actual damages, 1 Hotel's profits that are attributable to the alleged infringement, and restitution. Thus, Plaintiffs' articulation of any actual injury suffered based on the foregoing conduct is directly relevant to Plaintiffs' demand for actual and/or compensatory damages. Please supplement these responses with (i) articulation of any alleged actual injuries Plaintiffs claimed they suffered, and (ii) identification of supporting documents.¹
- **Interrog. Nos. 4-5; RFP Nos. 4-5.** These requests seek identification of any person(s) with knowledge of the allegations in the Amended Complaint, and the production of any documents or communications in those individuals' possession. The identity of the person(s) is directly relevant to the issues of the case and necessary for 1 Hotel to fully investigate the allegations asserted and damages sought. Plaintiffs did not provide any particularized objection to this request. Please provide a full response.
- **Interrog. No. 6.** These requests seek information relating to Plaintiff's involvement in other lawsuits. Plaintiff's own participation in litigation is readily available to her, her responses provided no explanation as to why providing this information would entail undue burden of expense. Please provide a full response.
- **Interrog. No. 7.** These requests seek disclosure of criminal convictions of felonies, or those involving false statements or dishonesty. Evidence of such convictions is admissible to demonstrate a "witness's character for truthfulness." Fed. R. Evid. 609. Plaintiffs' own criminal history is readily available to her, and her responses provided no explanation as to why providing this information would entail undue burden of expense. Plaintiffs did not provide any particularized objection to this request. Please provide a full response.
- **Interrog. No. 8.** This request seeks identification of every person(s) involved in the posting of the Photograph to Instagram as alleged in the Complaint (and re-alleged in the Amended

¹ 1 Hotel will withhold its request in Interrogatory No. 3 and RFP No. 3 for information related to Plaintiffs' incurred "attorneys' fees and costs of suit" until the information becomes relevant.

Sunny Khachatryan, et. al. v. 1 Hotel West Hollywood, LLC
Case No. 2:23-cv-10829-ODW (C.D. Cal.) – L.R. 37-1 Correspondence
July 16, 2024
Page 4

Complaint in ¶ 20). The identity of the person(s) involved is directly relevant to the issues of the case, specifically the issue of consent. Plaintiffs did not provide any particularized objection to this request. Please provide a full response.

- **Interrog. No. 10.** This request seeks identification of every person(s) involved in the Instagram messaging communications with 1 Hotel, as described in the Defendant's Partial Answer and Affirmative Defenses. The identity of the person(s) involved is directly relevant to the issues of the case, specifically the issue of consent. Plaintiffs did not provide any particularized objection to this request. Please provide a full response.
- **Interrog. Nos. 11-13; RFP Nos. 6-8.** These requests seek information and documents related to the purported modeling and acting careers of the Minor Plaintiffs as alleged in the Amended Complaint. This information is directly relevant to value of Plaintiffs' claims and the alleged damages sought. The information is also necessary for 1 Hotel to properly evaluate the relief sought and determine the appropriateness of the calculation Plaintiffs' use to reach the value of damages sought. Plaintiffs did not provide any particularized objection to this request. Please produce the requested information.
- **Interrog. Nos. 14-16; RFP No. 3.** These requests seek identification of Plaintiffs' social media accounts. These requests are relevant to issues of consent; in particular, whether Plaintiffs consented to the use of her information through these providers terms of service and/or through voluntarily provision. Plaintiffs did not provide any particularized objection to this request. Please produce the requested information.
- **Interrog. No. 17.** This request seeks basic identification of how and when Plaintiffs first identified the use of the Photograph on 1 Hotel's website. This request is directly relevant to the issues of consent and mitigation of damages. This information is personally known to Plaintiffs and there is attendant burden in responding to this interrogatory. Plaintiffs did not provide any particularized objection to this request. Please produce the requested information.
- **RFP No. 10.** This request seeks identification of any documents and/or communications between Plaintiffs and 1 Hotel. The production of such information is directly relevant to the issues of the case, specifically the issue of consent. Plaintiffs did not provide any particularized objection to this request. Please produce the requested information.
- **Interrog. No. 18; RFP No. 11.** These requests seek information and documents related to profits, wages, or other compensation received by the Minor Plaintiffs during the relevant period. This information is directly relevant to value of Plaintiffs' claims and the alleged damages sought. The information is also necessary for 1 Hotel to properly evaluate the relief sought and determine the appropriateness of the calculation Plaintiffs' use to reach the value of damages sought. Plaintiffs did not provide any particularized objection to this request. Please produce the requested information.

* * *

Sunny Khachatryan, et. al. v. 1 Hotel West Hollywood, LLC
Case No. 2:23-cv-10829-ODW (C.D. Cal.) – L.R. 37-1 Correspondence
July 16, 2024
Page 5

As stated above, "[c]ourts need not tolerate flagrant abuses of the discovery process." *Campbell*, 619 F.2d at 27.

Pursuant to Local Rule 37-1, please:

- (1) either confirm that you will provide supplemental responses curing your complete failure to respond to discovery by July 24, 2024, or provide your availability for a telephonic conference on either July 18, 2024 or July 19, 2024; and**
- (2) either promptly provide your revisions to the enclosed protective order, or confirm your consent to entry by joint stipulation.**

We look forward to seeing Plaintiffs' discovery responses.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "N. Dolce", written in a cursive style.

Nicolas V. Dolce

Exhibit 13

Dolce, Nicolas

From: Jaworski, Myriah
Sent: Tuesday, July 30, 2024 1:37 PM
To: Tyler R. Dowdall; Dolce, Nicolas; Brian A. Bloom; Eliezer Lekht; Lisa Niewdach; Renata Guidry
Cc: Brooke Genser; Patel, Chirag
Subject: RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Plaintiffs' Responses and Objections to Defendants' Discovery Requests

Tyler and Brian,

We would like to schedule a pre-filing conference of counsel under Local Rule 37-1. We are available on Thursday 8/1 between 12-3pm PST or Monday 8/5 between 2-5pm PST. Please let us know a time and date that works for you.

We would like to confer on:

- Plaintiffs' Deficient Rule 26(a)(1) damages disclosures, see 7/12 email from SH Group counsel.
- Plaintiffs' Failure to provide substantive response to SH Group Interrogatories – completely outstanding/no responses provided by Plaintiffs.
- Plaintiffs' 7/26 production deficiencies
 - Relevant timeframe – no information provided from 2022-present day.
 - No production concerning Plaintiffs Brave Johnson or Sunny Khachatryan
 - Communications, emails, correspondences produced at all.
- SH Group's Deposition notice to S. Khachatryan

Thanks,
Myriah

From: Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2024 11:53 AM
To: Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>; Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>; Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>; Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Renata Guidry <rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com>
Cc: Brooke Genser <bgsenser@tarterkrinsky.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>
Subject: RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Plaintiffs' Responses and Objections to Defendants' Discovery Requests

[External Message]

Myriah,

The assertion that our office is “only now gathering information” or that we have otherwise abrogated our responsibilities as counsel is resoundingly rejected. Your office served RFPs and we are working on gathering responsive information and documents to your discovery. That is a normal part of litigation.

Your email asserts that you are giving us until July 19 (last Friday, ie, three days ago) to serve supplemental responses. On the assumption that you hit a ‘1’ instead of a ‘2’, we will endeavor to serve supplemental responses by July 29.

Thank you,



Tyler R. Dowdall | Partner
T: 424-330-8580 | F: 212-216-8001
tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com | Bio
Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP
2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N | Los Angeles | CA | 90067
www.tarterkrinsky.com | LinkedIn

Crain's 2023 best places to work in NYC

From: Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2024 8:46 AM
To: Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>; Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>; Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Renata Guidry <rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com>
Cc: Brooke Genser <bgenser@tarterkrinsky.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>
Subject: [EXT] RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Plaintiffs' Responses and Objections to Defendants' Discovery Requests

Tyler and Brian:

Since before this claim was filed, SH Group has asked for records/documents supporting your clients claims and damages. As a party to litigation, and as counsel to a party in litigation, both the Khachatryan's and Tarter Krinsky as their counsel are obligated to search for and preserve relevant documents at the outset. The representation that you are only now gathering information and documents – days after your clients responses and productions to SH Groups discovery demands were due on 7/15 – is totally unacceptable.

Produce responsive documents to us by COB Friday, July 19. We will move to compel and/or for other discovery sanctions if a production is not made by this date.

Myriah

From: Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>
Sent: Friday, July 19, 2024 4:28 PM
To: Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>; Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>; Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>; Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Renata Guidry <rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com>
Cc: Brooke Genser <bgenser@tarterkrinsky.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>
Subject: RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Plaintiffs' Responses and Objections to Defendants' Discovery Requests

[External Message]

Myriah,

We will serve supplemental responses.

Can we have a bit more time please? We had to object to preserve our rights but need additional time to gather information/documents from the client. We will not be able to get everything together by July 24. I am also prepping for a trial starting 7/31 which is limiting my availability to assist.

Thanks,



Tyler R. Dowdall | Partner
T: 424-330-8580 | F: 212-216-8001
tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com | Bio
Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP
2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N | Los Angeles | CA | 90067
www.tarterkrinsky.com | LinkedIn

Crain's 2023 best places to work in NYC

From: Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2024 2:53 PM
To: Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>; Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>; Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Renata Guidry <rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com>
Cc: Brooke Genser <bgenser@tarterkrinsky.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>
Subject: [EXT] RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Plaintiffs' Responses and Objections to Defendants' Discovery Requests

Counsel – Per the below, please advise on your availability for a meet and confer tomorrow or Friday.

From: Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2024 9:43 PM
To: Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>; Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Renata Guidry <rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com>
Cc: Brooke Genser <bgenser@tarterkrinsky.com>; Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>
Subject: RE: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Plaintiffs' Responses and Objections to Defendants' Discovery Requests

Counsel,

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 37-1, please find attached Defendant 1 Hotel's discovery correspondence concerning deficiencies in Plaintiffs' July 15, 2024 Discovery Responses. In accordance with the local rules, we request to meet and confer via telephonic conference on either July 18th or July 19th – please let us know your availability on those dates.

Respectfully,

Nicolas V. Dolce

Attorney at Law

Clark Hill

130 E. Randolph Street, Suite 3900, Chicago, IL 60601
+1 312.360.2113 (office) | +1 312.517.7580 (fax)
ndolce@clarkhill.com | www.clarkhill.com

From: Brooke Genser <bgenser@tarterkrinsky.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2024 12:35 AM
To: Jaworski, Myriah <mjaworski@clarkhill.com>; Dolce, Nicolas <ndolce@clarkhill.com>; Patel, Chirag <cpatel@clarkhill.com>
Cc: Eliezer Lekht <elekht@tarterkrinsky.com>; Lisa Niewdach <lniewdach@tarterkrinsky.com>; Tyler R. Dowdall <tdowdall@tarterkrinsky.com>; Brian A. Bloom <bbloom@tarterkrinsky.com>; Renata Guidry <rguidry@tarterkrinsky.com>
Subject: Khachatryan v. SH Group - Plaintiffs' Responses and Objections to Defendants' Discovery Requests

[External Message]

Counsel:

For electronic service, please find attached Plaintiffs' responses to:

- 1) Defendants' Request for Interrogatories – Set One; and
- 2) Defendants' Request for Production of Documents – Set One.

Thank you,



Brooke Genser|Litigation Paralegal

T: 424-330-8579|F: 315-519-4074

bgenser@tarterkrinsky.com

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP

2029 Century Park East, Suite 400N|Los Angeles|CA|90067

www.tarterkrinsky.com

Crain's 2023 best places to work in NYC

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin is fully operational in-person. However, because of anticipated delays in receiving regular mail and other deliveries, please e-mail copies of anything you send by regular mail or delivery, including issuing remittances electronically. Please contact our receptionist at reception@tarterkrinsky.com or by phone at 212-216-8000 with any questions. Thank you in advance for your courtesies.

NOTE: If regular mailing or other specific transmission type is required by terms of a contract, order or statute, please comply with those obligations and transmit the materials by the means set forth in the agreement, order or statute as well as by email.

Confidentiality Disclosure: This information in this email and in attachments is confidential and intended solely for the attention and use of the named (addressee(s)). This information may be subject to attorney/client privilege or may otherwise be protected by work product privilege or other legal rules. It must not be disclosed to any person without our authority. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorized to disclose, and must not disclose, copy, distribute, or retain this message or any part of it.

This email is an informal communication that is not meant to be legally binding upon the sender unless expressly noted to the contrary.

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP, Attorneys-at-Law.

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin is fully operational in-person. However, because of anticipated delays in receiving regular mail and other deliveries, please e-mail copies of anything you send by regular mail or delivery, including issuing remittances electronically. Please contact our receptionist at reception@tarterkrinsky.com or by phone at 212-216-8000 with any questions. Thank you in advance for your courtesies.

NOTE: If regular mailing or other specific transmission type is required by terms of a contract, order or statute, please comply with those obligations and transmit the materials by the means set forth in the agreement, order or statute as well as by email.

Confidentiality Disclosure: This information in this email and in attachments is confidential and intended solely for the attention and use of the named (addressee(s)). This information may be subject to attorney/client privilege or may otherwise be protected by work product privilege or other legal rules. It must not be disclosed to any person without our authority. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorized to disclose, and must not disclose, copy, distribute, or retain this message or any part of it.

This email is an informal communication that is not meant to be legally binding upon the sender unless expressly noted to the contrary.

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP, Attorneys-at-Law.

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin is fully operational in-person. However, because of anticipated delays in receiving regular mail and other deliveries, please e-mail copies of anything you send by regular mail or delivery, including issuing remittances electronically. Please contact our receptionist at reception@tarterkrinsky.com or by phone at 212-216-8000 with any questions. Thank you in advance for your courtesies.

NOTE: If regular mailing or other specific transmission type is required by terms of a contract, order or statute, please comply with those obligations and transmit the materials by the means set forth in the agreement, order or statute as well as by email.

Confidentiality Disclosure: This information in this email and in attachments is confidential and intended solely for the attention and use of the named (addressee(s)). This information may be subject to attorney/client privilege or may otherwise be protected by work product privilege or other legal rules. It must not be disclosed to any person without our authority. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorized to disclose, and must not disclose, copy, distribute, or retain this message or any part of it.

This email is an informal communication that is not meant to be legally binding upon the sender unless expressly noted to the contrary.

Tarter Krinsky & Drogin LLP, Attorneys-at-Law.